

3

THE
Covenant of Grace,
NOT
Absolute, but Conditional.

Mhc8

1692

C83



JUN 25 '40

Plain

THE
Covenant of Grace,
NOT
Absolute, but Conditional,
Modestly Asserted.
AND THE
Preachers thereof **Vindicated,**
From the Unjust Aspersions of
ARMINIANISM and **POPERY:**
So Liberally bestowed upon them, by the
Maintainers of Dr. CRISP's, and other
Antinomian Doctrine.

Wherein is given a brief View of the

{	1. <i>Papists</i>	}	Opinion.
	2. <i>Socinian</i>		
	3. <i>Arminian</i>		
	4. <i>Antinomian</i>		
	5. And of the <i>Protestants</i> in general, on this Subject.		

Jam. II. 21. *Was not Abraham, our Father, justified by Works, when he had offered Isaac his Son, upon the Altar?*

He that made us without our selves, will not save us without our selves. Augustine.

LONDON:
Printed for Dorman Newman, at the Kings Arms in the Poultry, 1692.

THE
Covenant of Grace,
 NOT
Absolute, but Conditional,
 Modestly Asserted.

WHether the *Covenant of Grace* be conditional or absolute, is, saith Mr. Burges, a very troublesome Question. *Vind. Ley, lect. 26. pag. 249.* So indeed it proves in places where it is vented. It troubles the Faith of some, the Lives of others, and the Peace of very many.

New England hath felt the Troubles it occasioned. And many places in *Old England* are now suffering. I could therefore from my heart have wished, that either none at all had broached it in these parts; or if it must have been published, some other, rather than you, my dearest Friend and Reverend Brother, might have been the Author of that, meerly out of the great respect, and entire affection I bear unto you. But seeing you have not only set it on foot, but when a modest defence was made of the contrary Doctrine, without any either bitter Invective against your tenent, or so much as Reply unto your Arguments; you in divers Sermons renewed the Quarrel, replied unto the Arguments of the contrary side, not sparing to asperse them in too open a manner.

I thought it my duty I owe to truth, oppugned by, notwithstanding my Love unto you, to let you know, both wherein your Reply appears unsatisfactory unto me, and wherein offensive. Of the latter in the first place, which is as follows.

First, In the whole Series of your Discourse, you seemed to me to rank those of our Divines, who hold the Covenant of Grace to have conditions in the same File with *Arminians*, as if both

had maintained the same conditionate Redemption, or Salvability; wherein, whether you dealt fairly, I refer it to your conscience to consider. Now, tho I do not doubt, but that you know full well already how far we differ from them; yet shall I set down the difference in some particulars, and then endeavour to satisfy your Arguments, so far as they seem to reflect upon our Tenents. The Salvability, or potential and conditionate Redemption, maintained by the *Arminians*, may (I conceive) be reduced to these Four Particulars.

1. That Christ in dying, intended not the Salvation of any particular persons.

2. That the end of his Death was not to bring some actually to Salvation, but only that God thereby might have power (his Justice being satisfied) to give remission of sins to sinful man, on what conditions he pleased. So that Christ might have had his end, tho never a man had been actually saved.

3. That this is the Will of God, that none should enjoy Remission of sins, but on condition of Faith.

4. That Christ hath purchased Faith and Regeneration for none, but Remission and Reconciliation for all, which they shall actually partake of, who do believe. Nor is there need of infusing any spiritual vital principle into the hearts of men, to enable them to believe, they may do it of themselves.

The Third excepted, which of these Positions is maintained by any of those our Divines that hold Conditions to be in the New Covenant? Nay, they all maintain, That Christ in dying, intended the actual Salvation of particular persons, viz. of all those whom God from all Eternity had chosen. That for all those Christ hath obtained the actual application of salvation to them, as well as the purchase of it for them; which actual enjoyment of salvation, being according to God's appointment, to be obtained in a way of Faith, or upon condition of Faith, by or through Faith, as the Scripture speaks. They further aver, that the Lord Jesus Christ by his Death, hath also obtained at God the Father's hand, that the blessed Spirit should in time work this Faith in the hearts of his chosen, that so through Faith they might come actually to partake of all the benefits which he hath purchased for them.

So then *Arminians* maintain Conditions to be performed by us of our own power: Such ours disclaim, maintaining that it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do. *Arminians* maintain Conditions, so as if the Efficacy of Christ's Death were pendulous there-

thereon; This also ours disavow, maintaining that Christ hath purchased both *salvation to be given upon condition*, and *ability also to be given to perform that condition*.

Arminians maintain conditions preceding God's very electing us to *salvation*. *Ames coron. artic. 1. c. 1. § 4.* But ours maintain conditions antecedent of actual *salvation* indeed, but consequent in regard of *Election*.

The difference between our Divines, and the *Arminians*, about *Conditions*, being thus great, as hath been shewed, I think it would have been fair dealing in you to have severed them, and not have crowded them together into one and the same Reutation, as if they had maintained one and the same thing. Do you not think the Friends of *Pemle, Preston, Ames, Perkins, Ball, &c.* would take it ill to have them refuted under the Title of *Arminians*. and for maintaining *Arminian Salvability* (a Notion more abhorring to their Spirits than to your own, and which some of them have expressly written against?) yet do they all hold *Conditions* in the *Covenant*. And you refuse all such, who hold so, under that Head and Title. I challenge you to shew me any one of ours, that in pleading for *Conditions* in the *Covenant*, doth in the least degree assert that *Conditionate Redemption* or *Arminian Salvability*.

Before you come to our Arguments, you tell us, that tho you are against *Conditions*, yet you hold that God hath his order and method in conferring of his benefits. And that in regard of this Order, one benefit may depend upon another, &c. And that none are saved but such as do repent and believe.

I was heartily glad to hear so much from you: for this is the main I contend for, That God gives Faith, and then Salvation. And that Salvation depends on Faith, and therefore in order of Nature follows Faith. And here I would argue *ex concessis*. Those benefits which according to that Method and Order of conferring that the Lord hath set down to himself, must go before other, and on which others do depend; Those (I say) are required in us before the other which do depend on them, and follow them, can be obtained by us.

But Faith and Repentance are benefits which according to this Method of God are given before Salvation, and on which Salvation doth depend.

And therefore Faith and Repentance are actually required in us, before we can actually partake of Remission, Reconciliation,

The Covenant of Grace not Absolute,

Justification, and other benefits and branches of Salvation purchased by Christ.

If this were granted, that they are required, and that to the obtaining of Salvation (which must needs be granted, the benefit of Salvation not only following them, but also depending on them, as you confess) let them be required as *Conditions*, or as something else in God's Method and Order; I would not strive about terms. But I fear that you had here your reserve, and that you understand this priority of one benefit before another, and this dependance of one benefit upon another, either in reference to the manifestation of Salvation, or the perfection of that; and not in reference to the beginning and being of them; for so much some following passages hint out unto us; of which we shall speak more when we come unto them. Not long after you challenge Malice it self to shew, if it can, any one of your side that maintains Salvation without Repentance and Faith.

And here, Sir, if I should produce some that do assert it, should I not very prettily get me the odious Name of Malicious? Well, the Lord give us to hate the Affect and Fact as much as we do the Name. Truth is truth, and must be discovered. And I would to God there were not too many Expressions vented, both in Pulpits and Presses, too much tending this way.

I find in Mr. Saltmarsh, *Free Grace*, p. 102. *Do not the Promises belong to sinners as sinners? And* p. 104. *The Promises of Christ are held forth to sinners as sinners; not as repenting sinners, or humble sinners.* p. 105. *Whatever promise hath a condition in it, is ours in Christ, who only is the conditioned person for all promises.* p. 84. *So as we are to believe our repentance true in him, who hath repented for us.* p. 126. *All the conditions were on Christ's part, none on ours.* So p. 153. *In the New Covenant God gives himself freely in Christ, undertaking all both with the Father and the Soul, nothing being required on man's part.* Occasional word: *That those Ministers who press Repentance and Faith, do over-bear the Wine of the Gospel with Conditions and Qualifications, so the poor souls cannot taste it.* So also in Dr. Crispe, I meet with many such like, or the same passages, as in his *Christ alone exalted*, vol. 1. p. 120. *Christ belongs to sinners as sinners.* p. 211. *He receiveth sinners as sinners.* p. 164. *All the tie lies on God's part to do every thing that is mentioned in the Covenant.* p. 73. *Hast thou but a mind to Christ, come and taste of the water of Life freely; there is nothing looked for from thee to take thy portion in this Christ.* And in his second Volume, p. 420. *We are justified without works not only without the concurrence of them to Justification, but e-*

ven without the being of them, and presence in the person to be justified. I might name many more, but these may suffice; and I pray consider seriously whether from most, if not all those Assertions, doth not follow by Natural and Necessary Consequence that monstrous conclusion now enquired of, *viz.* that we may be saved without Faith and Repentance. Or, that Faith and Repentance are not necessary to Salvation. Truly they speak so fully to this particular, in my apprehension, that all that I can see left you to save your self is, not to own these men for men of your side. which I should be heartily glad to hear. But consider one passage more frequent, as in these Authors, so in your own Sermon; *This, That the Covenant of Free Grace is as free as that with Noah.* Now concerning that we know, that Men are partakers of the benefits promised in it, tho they neither know nor believe any such Covenant. And if this of *Salvation* be as free, will it not thence follow, that Men may be saved in it tho they never believe it, or so much as know it? To me it seems to follow without any constraint at all, as I shall labour to manifest by reducing it to an Argument, which I form thus.

By Vertue of the Covenant with Noah, Men are sure to be saved from an Universal Deluge, tho they neither know, nor believe such a Covenant.

Therefore if the *New Covenant* be as free as that with Noah, a Man may be saved in it, tho he neither know it, nor can believe it: More of this particular you may read in Mr. Gataker against *Saltmarsh*, both in the former Treatise, pag. 25. and in the *Rejoynder*, pag. 11, 13, 88. where he clearly sheweth this very Inference to be unconstrained, and makes good the Charge now in debate against Mr. *Saltmarsh*; which Reverend Author, if you had any reference unto in that unfavoury and noisome passage in your Sermon, *I challenge Malice it self*, I must needs tell you, you were exceedingly to blame.

Come we to your Arguments, whereby you labour to prove, that no conditions are annexed to the purchases of *Christ's Death* in regard of application. Your first was from those places of Scripture, which declare the All-sufficiency of *Christ's Death*, and the perfection of that in regard of *Impetration*, as *Heb.* 10. 14. and 1, 3, 9, 12. Unto which may be added your second Head of Scriptures, *viz.* those which hold out unto us Gods acceptance of this Price and acquiescence in it: as *This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased, &c.*

Now these do prove, that the Price paid by *Christ* was perfect and sufficient; yea, that it did fully impetrate, merit and purchase

chafe at the Fathers hands, the perfect and compleat Redemption of his Elect; So that God looks for nothing more to be done or suffered towards the making up of the price, but rests fully satisfied with the Sufferings of his Son. But they are of no force at all to take off any requisite necessary to the application of this purchase, be it Qualification Condition, Instruments or Agent: for instance, If I should on your ground argue, Jesus Christ hath by himself purged our sins, and perfected, &c. Therefore there is no need the Gospel should be preached unto Men, or that the Spirit of Grace be sent unto them to regenerate them; I doubt not but you would deny my Inference, as well you might. So where you reason, Christ by dying hath paid a perfect price, which was also accepted of God the Father. *Ergo*, there are no conditions annexed to the purchase of his Death; you must give me leave to deny your Argument. And the reason is, because they are not annexed as any part of the price, to make up it compleat; but only as the way and manner in which the means and instrument by which the terms and condition on which, and according to which God doth give, and Man receives salvation purchased: Notwithstanding that, Christ hath thus perfectly purchased it, yet himself doth tell me, that unless I repent, I shall perish, Luke 13. 3, 5. And it I believe not, I shall be damned, Mark 16. 16. As for that *Maxime* you cited in the profutation of your Argument, *Impetratio est fundamentum applicationis*, it makes for us, and not at all against us. For if it be *fundamentum*, the foundation, then it is not *ipsa applicatio*, the application it self, which is the Monster your side do hug and suckle. It makes indeed against *Arminian salvability*; for which End it is used by our Authors, viz to shew, that tho *Impetration* and *Application* may be distinguished, yet they cannot be separate or divided in their Object. But that for whomsoever Christ doth impetrate, to him the benefits impetrated must be applied; For *Application* (say they) is the End of *Impetration*, and *Impetration* the Foundation of *Application*. So that the *Arminian Doctrine* of Conditions to be performed by Man's own power, which make the Issue of Christ's death to be uncertain and pendulous on Man's Free will, is wholly razed thereby; but our *Doctrine of Conditions* purchased for us by the Death of Christ, and to be wrought in us by the Spirit of Christ are no way shaken. The purchases of Christ's Death may be surely applied to them for whom they are purchased, tho they be applied conditionally.

Nor is that other *Maxime* of any more strength, *posita causa totali sequitur effectus*, the total cause being put, the effect followeth; for

for if you speak of *man's actual Salvation*, or the application of *salvation unto man*, you cannot say, that *Christ's Death* is the *total cause* of it. The *whole and sole meritorious Cause* it is; But I hope *God's Grace* is the *impulsive cause*, *Christ's Spirit* the *efficient cause*, and *Faith* the *instrumental cause*. And *bonum est ex integris causis*, Good doth arise from all Causes entire. Now tho an *Instrument* be the *meanest of Causes*, yet is it necessary in the way of an *Instrument*, nor can the *Effect* be in *Act* before it be used.

Your third Head contained such Scriptures as speak of *Christ and Salvation*, as of a gift, a free gift; in pursuance of which you delivered, *Christ is given, freely given of God*. And if by *Grace*, then not of *Works*. And what can be laid on the creature that is not a work? If but a *Rose*, not free. To be freely, and by condition, is an absolute, and flat contradiction.

For Answer, the *Covenant with Adam*, in a passage before, you aver to be conditional; And in a passage following, you seem to intimate, that it is free, by saying, that *he could not have merited, had he kept the condition*. It seems then, that to be free, and yet to be conditional, as flat a contradiction as it is, you your self have admitted in the *Covenant with Adam*.

Did you seriously consider what you spake when you said, *If but to pay a Rose, the tenure is not free?* Certainly my Countreymen in *Glocestershire*, account that a very free Tenure, nor think I them therein mistaken. And if some Gentlemen should bestow on you an hundred pound a year, on condition you should be more liberal to the *Poor*, to the expence, not of a *Rose* or two, or a *Penny* or two but (it may be) *ten or twenty pound* a year, which unless you constantly exhibit, you were to lose the *Principal*. If for all this condition you should not say that this were a free gift, I should account you foully unthankful. If my Memory fail not, our Ancient Godly Divines use those similitudes of a *Rose*, or *Pepper-corn*, to set out the condition, not of *Faith*, but of *Good Works*, which they maintain to be required under the *Gospel*, as a *consequent condition*. By which Expression of theirs, they do, (as you say) destroy the *Freeness* of *Grace*. But your bare saying so, doth not prove it. The truth is, the *Arminians* and *Papists* were more beholding to you for some passages in your Sermons, than our Ancient Godly Protestant Divines.

But come we to your Argument, which if not taken out of *Dr. Crispe*, is yet certainly the same with his, vol. 1. p. 64 & p. 179. By gift, and on condition, is a flat contradiction.

But

The Covenant of Grace not Absolute,

But take heed that you and the Doctor make not the Scriptures to speak at solre and flat contradiction, which say, *We are saved by Grace through Faith* Eph. 2. 8. *And therefore it is of Faith, that it might be by Grace*, Rom. 4. 16. *And being Justified freely by his Grace through Faith in his Blood*, Rom. 3. 23. 24. And in the very place cited by you and the Doctor, Rom. 11. 6. *If by Grace, then it is no more of Works, otherwise Grace is no more Grace. But if it be by Works, it is no more of Grace, otherwise Works are no more Works*; where it follows, *what thinke Israel hath not obtained what he seeketh for*. And if you ask, wherefore? The Apostle will tell you, Rom. 9. 32. *Because they sought it not by Faith, but as it were by the Works of the Law*. So likewise, *Where is boasting then?* It is excluded. *Fyn what Law? Of Works?* Nay, but by the Law of Faith. Rom. 3. 27. *And to him that worketh not but believeth*, Rom. 4. 5. The Scriptures joyn Faith and free Grace; yea, they tell us, That freeness of Grace is upheld by that requisite or condition of Faith. But you call it a flat contradiction. The Scriptures oppose Faith and Works. But you say, *What can be laid upon the Creature, that is not a Work?* You will bear men in hand that we teach contradictions. But I am sure these passages of yours contradict the Scripture.

Again, did not Christ lay repentance and faith upon the creature, when he said, *repent and believe the Gospel*; Matth. 4. 17. Mark 1. 15. yea, doth he not lay it on them upon pain of damnation, when he doubles it *Luke 13. 35. except ye repent ye shall perish*; Did not the Apostles lay something on the creature, when they thus answered their troubled convertis, who in anguish of spirit came with these queries to them, *men and brethren What shall we do*; Acts 37. *And Sirs, what shall I do to be saved*; ch. 16. 20. I say, when they thus answered them, *repent and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and be converted*; Did they not require something of them, and lay something on them? And did Christ or his Apostles (think you) preach any thing contradictory to Free Grace, or Free Gift? I hope, whatever contradictions you pin on our Sermons, you will take heed what you fasten on the sayings of Christ and his Apostles, whose doctrine we must take leave to believe and follow, how contradictory soever it be deemed in the world. Do not say here, that Christ did not require them, nor his Disciples press them, *as conditions, or as a work* (which is the Doctors evasion) for you your self know that we disclaim faith as a work, as much as you. We maintain not any worthiness, excellency or merit in faith. I desire you to shew me if
you

you can, in any of ours, that faith doth justify as a work done by us or for any worthinels or excellency that is in it. I am sure that I can shew you the contrary, and you may also see it if you be pleased to peruse Mr. Gatakers rejoinder to Salmarsh. p. 5. 53. This is that we maintain, that Faith is to required of God, that if we have it, we shall have Salvation; and if we have it not, we cannot have Salvation, and that not only in Knowledg, but in the Being of it: Not only the Evidence, Declaration, and Manifestation of that (which is the Doctors Opinion, p. 168. and I fear is also yours) but not the Receipt, Benefit or Being of it, and that because it is required to the very obtaining of it, not in any Meritorious, but in an Instrumental way.

Now do not the Apostles aver as much when they Answer this query, What shall I do to be saved? Thus, Repent and Believe, &c. Do they not in these Answers lay Repentance and Faith on the Creature as things required of God in them that would be Saved, and that towards the obtaining of their Salvation, not the Evidencing or manifesting it only to themselves. And when the Apostle saith, the Jews came short of Righteousness, which the Gentiles attained unto, because they sought it not by Faith as the Gentiles did, Rom. 9. 31. Doth he speak of the *manifesto* of Righteousness, and not rather of Righteousness, and Justification it self, the being of it? Certainly the Jews fell short, not only of the Assurance, but of the Essence and Being of Righteousness, and that because they sought it not by Faith. So that Faith is required of God from the Creature so, and laid on the Creature so, that by it the Creature must seek everlasting Righteousness, the Being of it, or he shall for ever go without it.

But for the thing it self, that a gift may be free, and yet conditional, is no such contradictory proposition, but that both parts may be true, well stand together, and uphold rather than destroy each other; you might have seen in our Authors, if you had been pleased to look into them, or to have called to mind what I perswade my self you have formerly read in them. Camero would have informed you that all conditions do not destroy free Grace, *Sed ea quæ possunt habere rationem meriti*, but only such as are meritorious. Camero in Pl. 68. inter Arg. Solut. Med. ult.

And Doctor Prideaux, That to a Meritorious Work, four things are required, which are all of them wanting in our conditions. *Prideaux Ser. draught of the brook. And Perks Def. Cath. of Merit.*
C
First

First, It must wholly and entirely proceed from the undertaker. The person that will Merit, must do it of himself, out of his own strength and power : So was the condition of works to have been performed. Man had strength conveyed to him in created Nature, and was to have kept the condition by this his strength. But thus it is not in the conditions of the Gospel : We receive strength from Grace, to perform the conditions of Grace. God who requires them of us, works them in us ; he gives us Repent, he gives us to Believe ; which I think is the Crown of free Grace, that gives us a Crown upon our bare receiving it, and gives us also withal an Hand to take it.

Secondly, It must be a mans own, no way due or belonging to the Person of whom we Merit. Suppose a Tenant be three or four Years Rent behind with his Landlord, to the value (it may be) of one hundred pound, or two hundred pound ; and having nothing to Pay, should be freely forgiven by his Landlord, only on this condition, that he carefully pay his Rent for time to come. Shall this person say, the gift was not free because upon this condition ? Why the condition is due unto the Landlord, whether he forgive what is past or no, and therefore can no way detract from the freeness of the gift. So is our Faith due, our repentance is due (the fall, and the recovery by Christ supposed) to God from us, whether he forgive and justify upon them or no. And therefore the freeness of the gift of Righteousness is no way impaired by the requirement of them. When we have done all we are commanded, we must say we are unprofitable Servants, Luke 17. 10. *unprofitable saith Chamier, to ourselves.* Panstr. Cathol. tom. 3. l. 14. c. 16. and 21. add 25. we have not earned so much as thanks for our selves ; and that because we have done no more than what's our duty. *Opposita sunt solvere debitum & mereri : To pay or discharge a debt, and to merit or deserve, are opposite.* Ibid. 9. 38.

Thirdly, It must be one way profitable or advantagious to the person of whom we Merit.

Now this also fails : For, Can a man be profitable to God, as a wise man is profitable to himself ? Is it any gain or pleasure to him, that thou makest thy ways perfect ? Job 22. 2. and 35. 4. 5. What profit it is to the Sun, that we receive its light into our Houses ? Or to the Spring, that we drink of its Water ? God is no way indamaged by our Impenitency, nor advantaged by our return in to him ; all the emolument accrues to us our selves. And therefore tho he require our return unto him, and belief on him, if we will be saved by him, yet is his gift of Salvation nevertheless free, because

cause he is no way the gainer by the things required. Nay, the conditions required by him are matter of further charge and expence unto him, he being the worker and donor of them, as was shewed in the first particular. Suppose that some rich person should adopt a poor mans child to be his Heir, upon condition that the child be sent home unto him, to live with him, and to be trained and bred up in Learning by him. Shall the young man say, it is not free? Because it is upon condition, he leaves his Father's Cottage for it, he goes to School for it, &c. Alas, what profit are either of these to his foster Father? Nay, rather they are matter of further charge to him; for by reason of these, he is at cost for his Food, Apparel, Schooling, and other necessities to his Breeding and Education: So when the Lord who chooseth amongst his Enemies those whom he Adopts to be Heirs of Salvation, doth require of them, that they repent of their sin; believe on his Son, leave off all their vain ways, and learn to be like himself who is their Father: These Heirs of Grace cannot say that their Inheritance is not freely given, because it is given on these terms and conditions: For the things required are no way profitable to God who doth require them; but rather matter of further cost and charge unto him, who sends his word, his messengers, his graces, his spirit for the working of them.

4. It must be some way proportionable to the reward we expect for it, which also fails in our conditions; for what proportion is there between our Repentance and Remission, between our Faith and Justification. As the Apostle, our *light Afflictions, which are but for a moment, work forth unto us an exceeding, and eternal weight of glory* 2 Cor. 4. 17. So may we also say of our Repentance and Faith. If the Landlord should say to his Tenant (one hundred or two hundred pound indebted to him) These sums you owe, and I do not see where you have a penny to pay, I might use extremity towards you, cast you into Prison; and there let you Rot; but I will not deal so severely with you. Do but make an ingenuous acknowledgment of what you owe, and that you will be beholdling to me, and I will freely remit it. Shall this person say, he was not freely forgiven, because it was on this condition, his acknowledgment? Alas, what proportion is there between the debt and the acknowledgment? Thus God seems to speak to us in the matter of Repentance. *Only acknowledge thine iniquities.* Jer. 3. 13.

The sum of all is, That a man gives freely, which he gives

on condition, when withal he gives ability to perform the condition; else salvation given for, and through Christ would not be free.

But such are the conditions we plead for, as our duties, so Gods gifts and graces: and therefore the gift of salvation, notwithstanding them, is free.

Again, That we give on condition, the condition being the parties duty to whom we give, is free, else the portions that Parents give dutiful Children would not be free gift.

But such are the conditions maintained by us; such as we owe of duty to God, whether he give or no; he giveth therefore freely, though he require them.

3. That we give on conditions, the conditions being no way beneficial to us who give, no way equivalent to the thing we give, nor any way causal of our giving, we give most freely.

But such also are the conditions defended by us, as hath been made apparent, they no way benefit the Lord at all, they are infinitely disproportionable to the gift of salvation he bestows, nor do they any way move him to bestow salvation; but rather his will and purpose to bestow salvation, moves him to bestow them, that by receipt of them, his people might be fitted for the salvation he intends them.

And therefore notwithstanding that they are required, the gift of salvation is most free.

Thus have we done with your Argument, from the freeness of grace (which, that it may well stand with our conditions, I hope is well cleared) as also with your Arguments taken from scripture. We come now to those you fetch from Reason. The first of which was taken from the intent of Christ in dying, which the Scriptures hold out to be the salvation of those for whom he died. Now (say you) *if he died conditionally, it will follow that he willed not their salvation at all, but their damnation, as much or more than their salvation; for he wills their salvation if they believe, otherwise their damnation; and it is natural to them not to believe.*

This and all that follows in the Argument, may make against the Arminians, who hold that Christ hath purchased salvation for us, but not faith, and that he died for us conditionally (*i. e.*) that we should be saved if we did believe, but did no way procure for us that we should believe; and accordingly it is used by our Authors, though in other terms, to destroy the Arminians conditionally;

tionally; as you may see in *Owen, Universal Redemption*, p. 108, 109, 110. But conditional redemption, in which the conditions are purchased, as well as the salvation (which is that we maintain) it no way oppugneth. Put case an outlandish man should procure for his Son some inheritance in our Country to be enjoyed by him upon his enfranchisement; you cannot say he intended his Sons non-enjoyment of it, as much as enjoyment, because of the condition of his Infranchisement, if that the Infranchisement be procured by the Father as well as the inheritance. The Purchasers intent (I hope is) full and firm. Notwithstanding the conditionality of the purchase, when the condition is purchased, as well as the thing. So when we maintain that Christ hath procured Salvation for us, to be enjoyed conditionally, if we do believe. We cannot infer thence, that he intended our damnation as much as salvation, because we have no power to believe; for we maintain also, that Christ hath purchased for us, that we shall believe.

Sir, *Arminians* say, that Christ died for us that we might be saved if we do believe; we, that Christ died for us, that we should believe, and believing have life through his name. *Owen* p. 112.

Dare you say that Christ died for any so absolutely, as that they should be saved whether they did believe or no? I hope you will not, tho your paralleling the *New Covenant* with that with *Noah* doth naturally yield such an inference, as hath already been shewed.

Your second Argument was the same with one you used in your former Sermons, where you asserted the absoluteness of the new Covenant, viz. *That this conditionality infers a liberty of will.*

But Sir, that those who plead for conditions are no way maintainers or abettors of free will, their writings sufficiently declare.

You make men believe that we preach not repentance as the grace of God by his Spirit, wrought in our hearts in and for Christ, which is most untrue; and who of us denies faith to be the gift of God, or that God out of his love to us in Christ, freely worketh it in us, that thereby we may be enabled to receive Christ. Gataker Rejoynd. p. 31. That we are not only half dead, but quite dead, and can do nothing that is good until the Spirit quicken us; cannot go to Christ till God the Father draweth us: cannot believe on Christ nor repent of sin until the Lord give it unto us, and enable us thereto, is a doctrine I have

have long ago learned from their Sermons, and often meet with in their writings. And as for the Inference, he which chargeth the Patronage of free will on that kind of preaching, that holds out life and salvation upon condition of faith and repentance, let him look to it how he will quit Christ and his Apostles from that charge, whose Sermons are full of counsels, commands and calls, that require men to repent and believe, if ever they would be saved. Sir, conditions to be performed by us of our own strength and power, which the *Arminians* maintain, argue a power in mans will indeed. But conditions purchased by Christ for us, and to be wrought by his Spirit in us, which we maintain; Infer no power of free will at all.

Your third Argument was taken from Election. *That from this conditional Redemption would follow, that men are elected but conditionally; so that God's Election should be undetermined and ineffectual, and the Will of God should be made subordinate to the Will of the creature.*

Sir, God may be said to elect conditionally two ways.

1. So as that the condition be considered as antecedent to his Election, moving him to will Salvation to such a person. This Conditionality indeed subordinates the Will of the Creator to the Creature, and causeth Election to be undetermined and ineffectual. But such kind of conditions, we oppunge as *Arminian*.

Or 2. So, as that the condition precede indeed the actual enjoyment of the benefits to which men are elected, but follows Election it self. And this consideration of conditions of Election we propugne, as no way evacuating either the efficacy or determinateness of God's Election, nor yet in any wise subjecting the Will of God to the Will of Man therein. Hear what Dr. Ames saith to this verything. *It never was denied by our Divines, that Faith was maintained as a condition antecedent indeed to salvation, but consequent unto, or following Election it self; (i. e.) but hath been constantly religiously maintained.* Cor. de Elect. c. 1. § 4. p. 7. No, Sir, our Doctrine concerning conditions, doth no way destroy the certainty of Election. But on the contrary, the Doctrine of Election doth confirm this our Tenent of Conditional Redemption. For so as God from all Eternity purposed Salvation unto us, and elected us thereto; So did Christ purchase it, and so is it actually to be applied. But God hath from the beginning chosen us to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the Truth, 2 Thes. 2. 13. And heretofore Christ
d.d

did purchase it to be obtained that way, and that way it is actually to be enjoyed. So that till we be brought over to the belief of the truth. and some degree of Sanctification; we cannot be said actually to partake of any part of the Salvation purposed or purchased. That God elects for Faith foreseen, we utterly deny; but that he electeth through or by it, i. e. Salvation to be obtained through or by it, we religiously maintain.

Your fourth Argument runs thus, *If the purchases of Christ's death have any condition annexed to them in regard of application, then these conditions share with Christ in the business of salvation.* It is the same with another of your Arguments used in your former Lectures, and near of kin to that of Dr. Crisp, Vol. 1. p. 168. *Then Christ justifieth not alone. Is Faith Christ himself? If not, then Christ must have a Partner to justify.*

But the Sequel both in yours and the Dr's Argument is notoriously false; and that because *conditions* are not required in the same way of causality that Christ's Righteousness is. For that is required as a meritorious cause, purchasing and procuring man's peace; Faith is an instrument apprehending it, and Christ the cause of it; Repentance as a way leading to it, or Qualification fitting a person for it. Now when an effect depends on divers Causes of a different kind, the Necessity of the one, argues not the insufficiency of the other, but the one may be sufficient in its kind, tho the other be required. The wounded person must apply the Plaister to the Wound, if he will have it heal him. The diseased person must drink the potion, must travel to the Bath, and bathe himself therein, if he will have either the Potion to purge him, or the Bath to cure him. Yet would it be great Weakness in either of these, to say, that the Plaister, the Potion, the Bath were not sufficient, because they were required to go unto the one, to take and apply the other; for their taking, going, drinking, applying, are not required in the same sanatory and medicinal way as the Bath, the Plaister, or the Potion are; but only in an Instrumental way, to bring these home to him, that so they might work upon him. So, nor is my Repentance and Faith required in any satisfactory, or meritorious way, to satisfy Gods Justice together with Christ, or merit Remission for me; no, Christ doth that alone, they are only repired to fit me for Christ, and bring me to Christ. Did we ascribe any merit or worthiness to our conditions, then you might say indeed that we made them Partners with Christ; but we

we abhor this as much as you. Faith, saith Mr. Gataker, affords not the least mite towards the making up of that price, wherewith our debt is to be discharged. Rejoynder, p. 47.

That this Answer would be made unto your Argument, you your self foresaw; and therefore to anticipate it, you say, ——— But some distinguish between Conditions, and meritorious Conditions, &c. Unto which you reply, That this is a most weak Evasion, for Papists themselves ascribe no Merit to the preparations they plead for, and cite for it. *Conc. Trid. Sess 6. c. 8.*

And here, Sir, is a second calumny. For as before you ranked us with *Arminians*, so here you would insinuate that we joyn hands with Papists in maintaining of this conditional Redemption. But as I hope I have vindicated it from the charge of *Arminianism*, so I doubt not also to clear it from this of *Papism*.

Is it enough, my good Friend, to make a thing evil, to say that Papists hold so? Why did you cite *Astius* and *Lessius*, both Papists, among the Champions of your Opinion? Papists agree with us, and we with them in many things. Nor call we that *Papish* where they are sound, and agree with us, but that only wherein they being *Erroneous*, we dissent from them, and protest against them. Now whether or no Papists maintain any Meritoriousness in the preparations they defend, sure I am, that Protestant Authors chiefly oppose this Meritoriousness of them, as I shall prove unto you.

First then, consider that what *Chemnitius* reply, to that very place and passage of the Council that you cite, if I have not mist your Quotation. His words are these:

If therefore this were the mind and judgment of the Synod, that it would simply shew that manner and order which God doth use according to the Doctrine of the Scripture, when he intends to bring men to justification; and if they would not attribute those things which the Scripture teacheth do go before it, to the strength of free will, but to the Grace of God, and Operation of his Holy Spirit, nor place any merit or worth in those preparations for which we may be justified; we might easily be agreed concerning the word preparation, rightly understood according to the Scripture. Exam. part 1. p. 172.

Out of which of *Chemnitius*, I observe three things.

(1.) That however in that Session they did daube over the matter, yet they did hold a dignity, worth, and merit of congruity to be in these preparations; which the same *Chemnitius* doth

doth afterwards prove at large, spending three or four leaves therein. (2.) That *Chemnitius* held something, some work wrought by the Spirit in Man to precede his Justification, or his reception of Justification; for in the following Paragraph: Thus he speaks.

It is therefore false, which in the ninth Canon they attribute to us, as if we taught that not any motion of the Will given by God, and excited by him, doth go before our Receiving of Justification: For we do altogether teach that repentance and contrition do go before. We do not say, that they go before as a merit, which by its worth doth cooperate to the obtaining of justification; but as the sense of sickness or grief of a wound, is not any merit of the cure, but doth raise and stir up to desire, seek out and welcome the Physician. For the whole hath no need of the Physician, but they that are sick, as Christ saith.

And in this sense, *those things (as the Scripture saith) do go before.*

3. That he could easily have agreed with those *Tridentine* Fathers about preparations (the word Preparation being rightly understood, and according to Scripture expressions;) if they would not have ascribed them to the strength of free will, nor have put the worth and merit of justification upon them. By this (I think) it is plain, that they were meritorious preparations that *Chemnitius* did oppose in his writings against the Papists. And truly I wonder, that you should cavil at that distinction I gave between a condition and a meritorious cause: And more, that you should say that Papists ascribe no merit to conditions, and preparations. You know the question concerning the conditional promises of the Gospel is handled under that concerning the necessity of works, where our Writers grant a necessity of presence, but not of efficiency, which *Bellarmino* contends for. Now I pray, what do they understand by that efficiency, but a meritorious efficacy? Or, what other then that can be ascribed unto works? yea, that our Authors understand merit by that efficiency, they deny. Add to *Chemnitius*, *Chamier*, and consider two passages in him.

But the Gospel doth not promise salvation without any condition of observing the Law, nor did ever any of ours teach that: So that he do not take the word condition for merit. And in ch. 5. Sect. 11. For the condition of Faith is not antecedent, but consequent, because there is no merit of Faith considered, or Faith is not the cause of Salvation. To these joyn Doctor Ames, who saith.

We do not deny that good works have any relation to Salvation; for they have the relation of an adjunct consequent, and of the effect to Salvation

tion obtained (as they speak;) and of an adjunct antecedent, and disposing to Salvation to be obtained; and also of an Argument confirming our assurance and hope of Salvation: But we deny that any works of ours can be a meritorious cause of Justification and Salvation. And in the Chapter before, Promises with a condition of obedience as the causes of that right which we have to the thing promised, are proper to the Law; but promises with condition of obedience, as of the adjunct or effect of the thing promised, or the donation of it, have place in the most bountiful kingdom of Grace, where there is no place found for our merits. Cap 5. Sect. 2.

Bishop Davenant shall be the next, who averring repentance, faith and love to be necessary to justification, adds by way of explication, and in opposition to the Popish sense of necessity.

These and the like inward works of the heart are necessary to all that are justified: not because they containe in themselves that efficacy or merit of justification; but because according to Gods ordination either they are required as conditions precedaneous to, or concurrent with justification, as to repent, and to believe; or else as effects necessarily flowing from justifying faith; as to love God, to love our neighbour. De just. act. cap 30.

Q. 1. Argum. 1. And in his next Chapter, stating this question, whether good works may be said to be necessary to justification and salvation? he sets down in his first and second conclusions, that in controversies with Papists, and Sermons to vulgar people, we should not use such expressions without due explication of them, and that because both Papists and people will be ready to understand them necessarily as meritorious causes of salvation. Shewing by example of the Ancient Fathers how careful they have been to forbear some forms of speech, by reason of the corrupt sense of hereticks: to which purpose he alledgeth that of Hierom; that which may well be spoken, is not so netimes to be spoken by reason of the Ambiguity.

Nevertheless in his fifth, sixth and seventh Conclusions he maintains, that they are necessary thereto though not as meritorious causes, yet as previous and concurrent conditions. Let Mr. Perkins be the first we name for this particular; who in his Reformed Catholick, besides the head of Merit, (which wholly make for us and shews sufficiently the Papists to be Patrons of merit) in that of Repentance, speaking of the differences between us and Papists, therein saith, The fourth abuse is touching the effect and efficacy of Repentance; for they make it a meritorious cause of remission of sin, and of life everlasting, flat against the Word of God. And a little after: They ascribe to their contri-

tion

tion the merit of congruity, which cannot stand with the sufficient merit of Christ. We for our parts hold, that God requires contrition at our hands not to merit remission of sins, but that we may acknowledge our own unworthiness, be humbled in the sight of God and distrust all our own merits; and further, that we may make more account of the benefit of Christ, whereby we are received into the favour of God, and more carefully shun sin for time to come. But we acknowledge no contrition at all to be meritorious save that of Christ. I might add to these, learned Camero In Psal 68. in solut. arg. med. ult. and repeat that which I cited out of him before, it being the very distinction which you call a most weak evasion; and the defence of which, we are now upon. As also renowned Pemble, who spends a whole Chapter in refuting that opinion of Bellarmine, and the Romanists; viz. That faith justifies us as an efficient and meritorious cause obtaining, deserving, and in its kind beginning justification Tract. of Justif. Sect. 2. c. 1. But I shall content, my self with the recital of two more, who handle the very Question now in controversie, Whether the Promises of the Gospel be absolute or conditional? And determine that they are absolute not conditional. The first of these is Broachman who saith, It is not controverted, Whether the promises of the Gospel, that they may be fruitful and saving, do require faith: Neither is it called into controversie, Whether the promises of the Gospel be so free and absolute, that they discharge a man from a serious sorrow for sins, and from all study of good works; For he must be an infant in Scripture, that is not acquainted with these assertions of the holy Spirit. But the true state of the question is, whether the Gospel for any our worth, intention, work, merit, or any disposition in us, doth promise to us grace, mercy, remission of sin and eternal life; or rather for and through Jesus Christ apprehended by faith. Syst. tom 2 art de Evang. c. 2. And again, in answer to Bellarmines fifth objection, which was, that the promises of the Gospel do always require the condition of Faith: Thus he saith; which we grant. And further avers, that this condition of faith will stand with his Assertion of absolute promises: For saith he, We warned you in the beginning, that it is not Controverted, Whether the promises of the Gospel do require Faith, which we willingly grant: But whether in the free remission of sins, the condition of Faith be required as any work of ours, or certain disposition in us; to which, as to an efficient, helping, or cooperating cause, the free remission of sins may be ascribed; which we do roundly deny.

The other is Mr. Burges, Vind. Leg. Lect. 26. p. 249. who asserts the same out of Broachman, as I conceive. By these Citations I

hope it will more then sufficiently appear to an eye not strangely possess'd with prejudice.

1. That the distinction between a Condition, and a meritorious Cause, is no slender and weak Evasion, but a main and fundamental Distinction in this Controversie, such as on which the very hinges of the Controversie do h turn.

2. That your saying That Papists ascribe not any Meritoriousness to conditions, &c. is most false, if there be any truth in these Protestant Collections; yea, that it doth asperse these Reverend Protestant Authors fore-nam'd, who oppose the Papist in the very particular.

3. That those of our Divines who maintain conditional promises in the Covenant, whilst withal they exclude all claim of dignity, worth, merit, or any such causality from these conditions, do not joyn with Papists, as you would make the people believe, but with Protestants against Papists; and differ not one hairs breadth from those who aver the Covenant to be absolute, not conditional; For by the *Conditions* which they deny, they understand *meritorious Conditions*.

4. That in rejecting this distinction between a Condition and a meritorious Cause, and asserting the Covenant to be without, not only meritorious conditions, but all other also: you oppose all Orthodox Divines that ever I met with, not only those that hold the Covenant to be conditional, but those also who *in terminis* aver the absoluteness of it, (for by the conditions they reject, they understand meritorious ones, as hath been shewed) and joyn with Mr. *Satmarsh*, Dr *Crisp*, and such other whom the Orthodox, not out of malice, but for distinction sake; and for the due desert of some of their Tenents do call *Antinomians*.

But let us see what further strength you bring to the battering of this distinction; for your charge of Popery will not hold, You add therefore farther; *Did Adams doing merit life; None will say it. Yet the Grace of God is more shewed in the latter then in the first Covenant* Therefore in it no conditions at all.

Sir the Apostle saith, *To him that worketh the reward is reckoned, not of grace, but of debt*, Rom 4.4. I know some hold the Covenant with Adam, wherein works were enjoyned, to be a Covenant of Grace. I have heard Mr. *Simonds* of Holland deliver that in a Sermon at Rederith and thereupon divide the Covenant of Grace into the Covenant of Works, and the Covenant of Faith. Certainly

ly had *Adam* kept the condition of the first Covenant. he had done no more than his Duty; nor had he profited God at all; besides, there would have been small or no proportion between that his Work and the reward; all which are required to merit proper. So that in some sense that may be called a Covenant of Grace. Nevertheless in the latter Covenant of Faith, the Grace of God is so far more fully, richly, and gloriously manifested, than in that of Works, as that it obtaineth the title of the Covenant of Grace. The Apostle saith, *it was by Faith, that it might be by Grace*, Rom. 4. 16. And the Scripture being so plain for it, I ought to believe it, though I could not make it out to others, wherein it was free, nor yet apprehend it my self.

But, my good Friend, the business is not so difficult but that it may be, and hath been already dispatched by some of our side, and the freeness of the latter above the former, notwithstanding the conditionality of both, at large discovered. And that not by excluding faith, or the condition of faith from the latter (as you would have it) for that would interfere with that of the Apostle now cited, *By Faith, that it might be of Grace*; where Faith is taken in, not left out to make out the freeness. Nor yet only because faith is given of God, and so ability to keep the latter Covenant is given, which is something. For though that strength, *Adam* had to keep the first Covenant was freely bestowed on him by God in his Creation, yet when God was pleased to enter into a Covenant with him, he had it in him, and was to work in his own strength and power. Whereas in the New Covenant God finds man in an impotent, weak and dead condition; and graciously promiserh to work in him ability to do what he requireth: This (I say) is something that serves to shew the freeness of Divine Grace in the New Covenant; for the Apostle saith expressly, Ephes. 2. 8. *We are saved by Grace through Faith, and that not of our selves, it is the gift of God*; where the giving of the thing required, to wit, Faith, is introduced by the Apostle to shew the freeness of Grace.

But the superabundancy of Grace in the latter Covenant appears mostly in this, that in the former, the matter of mans Justification had been something of his own, his own exact and perfect obedience to the Law of God; but in the latter, the matter of it is anothers, the perfect Righteousness of Christ. In the one, man runs into himself for the price of his life and happiness:

But

But in the other, faith carries him out of himself unto another, the Lord Jesus Christ for all. In the one, the condition it self and the keeping of it, was to have been the matter of mans Righteousness, the ground of his Justification. In the other, it is only the Instrument and Mean. In the one, the condition it self (*Works*) procured life, in and of themselves, without any reference to any other; but in the other, *Faith* is looked on, not as a *Work*, but as an *Instrument*; nor doth it save for any excellency, worth or vertue that is in it; but only because it lays hold on Christ. I cannot better express my self than in Mr. Gatakers words, *Rejoynder*. p 46, 47. *In the one, Works are considered, as in themselves performed by the Parties to be justified and live. In the other, Faith is considered and required, not as works barely done by us, but as an Instrument whereby Christ is apprehended, in whom is found, and by whom that is done, whereby Gods Justice is satisfied, and life eternal meritoriously procured for us; so that they differ as much as these two Propositions.*

1. Pay your debt of a thousand pounds and be free. 2. Rely on such a friends satisfaction made for it and be as free as if you had made full payment and satisfaction your self. All this and more you may find in that reverend Divine, your contempt of whom, and all other not of your way, sads the hearts of your friends, and makes them fear that which they are loth to suspect concerning you.

You proceed, and tell us, that though it be not meritorious, yet if it be Antecedent, it must be Effective; For an Antecedent condition is effective. *Conditio Antecedens est effect.*

Sir, By your own maintaining faith to be an instrument in the work of our salvation (which I think is more than a condition, tho no more I believe than truth) you must of necessity grant it both a precedency & efficiency therein; for instruments are always reckoned to the efficient cause, and in order of nature precede the effect. And thus I conceive that faith is effective in the work of our salvation, as an instrument receiving Christ, not as a condition. Conditions are not effective, but instruments are. As for that of Chamier, that a condition Antecedent is effective; *Tom. 3. l. 5. c. 5. §. 2.* I conceive he means meritorious, the passage cited out of him already leading me to that conjecture: For (saith he) the Condition of faith is not Antecedent, but consequent, because no merit of faith is considered, or faith is not the Cause of Salvation *ibid.* § 16 Now that Conditions are meritorious, yea or so much as impulsive, is altogether denied by the Assertors of conditions, who allow no causality

lity at all to them. It rests on you to prove that the Antecedency of a condition doth infer its causality: For though *Chamier* aver it, yet I see no ground for that his Assertion, especially in such conditions, as those we maintain in the New Covenant.

Your first Argument runs thus: *If Conditions be annexed, &c. Then no man can be sure of the benefits purchased whilst he lives; for the conditions must be performed, &c.* To which we may add two Arguments of your former Sermons, the first the very same with this: *If salvation were on condition, then none could be sure of salvation, for none can be sure to hold out in performance of the Condition.* The other, *If any condition be required, then none can be saved for none can perform the condition.* Adam could not abstain from one tree when he was in the state of Innocency. Much less —

First, Sir, your instance of Adam, we conceive it unsound. That he did not abstain, we find by woful experience; but that he could not, we deny. *Recepit posse si vellet, non autem velle ut posset*, saith a Father. Adam had power to have abstained if he would; only his will was not confirmed in good; whereupon it came to pass that he freely fell.

Secondly, Your weapon may be turned against your self: For whereas you hold, That none are saved but such as believe, it may be objected unto you out of your own Argument; Then none can be saved, for none can believe; or, Then none can be sure of Salvation, because none can be sure to hold out in believing.

Thirdly, It seems to me directly to cross the Apostle, who tells us, That it was of faith, that the Promise might be sure to all the Seed, Rom. 4. 16.

Fourthly, Whereas you say, *That if Conditions be required, then none can be sure, because none can be sure to hold out;* Do you not seem to intimate that salvation is sure to the Elect, whether they hold out in the faith or not? which is the Monster Arminians would father upon our Tenents.

For answer therefore to your Argument, the main of it may wound an *Arminian* who holds falling from grace: but as for those who hold no such uncomfortable Doctrine, it no way toucheth them. We say with David, 2 Sam. 23. 5. *Although my house be not so with God, yet he hath made with me an everlasting Covenant ordered in all things and sure.* For he hath promised to circumscribe our hearts, to write his Laws in our hearts, to give us a new heart, and then through grace, after our recovery, we may do that which

which in our sick, dead, and corrupt estate we could not do; namely, keep the condition in an Evangelical way, wherein though exact perfectness be required, yet is repentance admitted, and sincerity accepted.

Again, he hath promised to put his fear in our hearts, that we may not depart from him Jer. 32. 40. And we are confident that he who hath begun a good work in us, will perform it to the day of Christ, Phil. 1. 6. *Qui operatur ut accedamus, idem operatur ne discedamus.* We answer therefore the main of your Argument, even as we answer the Arminians, That though in regard of our own strength, which is weak, we may fear, yet in regard of Gods manutenuency we are sure. Who will keep us, not without, but by and through the Mean, he hath appointed us, even faith; by which, as he brings us into a state of Salvation, so through the same he will keep us by his Almighty power unto Salvation, 1 Pet 1. 5. We are as sure of perseverance in observation of the condition as of Salvation; holding both of God by like tenure of free promise.

Salvation you see then, may be obtained, notwithstanding the conditions required, because God hath promised to give ability to perform them, and to persevere in the performance of them. This you foresaw would be replied, and therefore anticipate it by saying, But God hath promised to give faith. To which you rejoyn, I demand, Whether that Promise be absolute or conditional? And anon, there is no reason why one Promise should be more absolute than another.

But 1. Sir, Whether absolute or conditional, a Promise it is, and such as doth assure the soul of the condition on which salvation is given. So that Salvation is sure, notwithstanding the conditionality of the Covenant, and the sinews of your Argument are cut in two.

2. For your Quarry, Whether it be conditional or absolute? I conceive it absolute. Christ procured Salvation for us to be bestowed conditionally, if we do believe; but faith it self hath he absolutely procured without prescribing of any condition; so that it is equivalent to an absolute purchase in respect of the event and issue, Owen Univers. Redemp. l. 3. c. 1, & 2. Amel. Cor. p. 389. For my part, I cannot imagine how any condition (I mean Antecedent condition, for a Consequent condition they may admit of) can be annexed to those Promises. *I will write my Laws in their hearts; and I will put my fear into their hearts, and I will take the stony heart out of their bodies, &c.* unless free will be granted. And therefore I conceive those promises

to be absolute in regard of Antecedent conditions. Now whereas you say, *There is no reason why one Promise should be more absolute than another*; the will of the Covenant Maker to have it so, is it self a sufficient Reason. Is it not the will of God to give Christ absolutely, and then Salvation for Christ's sake to them that do believe in him? Shall I say here, That there is no reason why one gift should be more absolute than another? He who worketh all things according to the counsel of his own will, hath infinite Reason both for his will and working. In the mean while, Sir, your Reason from the certainty of Salvation, is (I think) sufficiently discovered to have nothing of force against Protestant conditional Redemption.

Your last Argument was taken from the Analogy or Resemblance betwixt Christ and Adam; *As by the one, sin is conveyed; so by the other Righteousness: but by the one sin and death are conveyed without Condition; Ergo.*

I doubt not Sir, but that you will remember the old rules; viz. 1. That similitudes run not on all four. 2. Nor are Argumentative. I might as well argue hence, That all mankind are redeemed by Christ, because they were all destroyed by Adam: Or that all were not corrupted by Adam, as Peter Martyr on the place tells me, Ambrose and Origen did hence hold, because all are not repaired by Christ; Or with Bellarmine, That Adam conveyed inherent sin to his posterity whereby they perish, and therefore the Righteousness of Christ conveyed for our recovery must be inherent. We should many ways clip the truth of God, if we should every way make these lines run parallel. Hear Peter Martyr to the very point, *This Analogy holds true only in the general: but in respect of the particular, and the kinds, there is great difference. Adam conveys sin by Propagation to his Posterity. But Christ conveyed Righteousness by Faith.*

After this you had a passage concerning actual Righteousness and actual Reconciliation, to this purpose: *Unless men will grant that Christ purchased a suitability, the Salvation purchased must be actual; for Inter actum & potentiam non datur medium.*

Sir, I know none of ours that deny, that Christ purchased actual Salvation for those for whom he died; i. e. That in time they should be actually saved in that way and method agreed on between the Father and the Son. The thing we deny is, That the Salvation purchased, is actually theirs for whom its purchased before they come actually to believe. You must give us leave to distinguish between the Purchase and, the Pos-

session: The Grant or Donation of a Benefit, and the actual exhibition and reception of it. The child may have an Inheritance purchas'd for him, and bequeathed to him before he is born, but he must be born before he can enjoy it. *Abraham* had the grant and Donation of *Canaan*, long before his had the actual possession of it. Hear we *Dr. Ames* in this particular; *All and each have grace and Salvation given, though they have not the possession of the thing given before Faith.* Cor. p. 126. 127.

Now unto these Arguments let us add one or two more out of your former Sermons about the absoluteness of the Covenant; many of which having fallen in with those already discussed, and not above one or two remaining.

The first, *If any thing were required on our part, then boasting could not be excluded.* This also *Dr. Crisp*, vol. 10. p. 71. *If any thing were done on our parts to partake of Christ, we might have wherein to boast,* Rom. 4. 2.

But I pray consider seriously how cross this your Argument is to the very Text. For did not *Abraham*, the party spoken of there, do something for his part to partake of Christ, when he believed? Yet was he excluded from boasting. And doth not the Law of Faith, the Gospel, require faith on mans part, that Righteousness may be imputed? Why else is it called a Law? Yet the Apostle saith expressly, that by this Law boasting is excluded, *Rom. 3. 27.* If indeed we could do any thing in a meritorious way, we might boast, not otherwise. The Beggar I hope, hath little to boast of, and yet doth he both crave and receive his Alms. The sinner hath less: For as that he doth, can no way merit, no more than the beggars craving and receiving; so nor can he do that, until the Lord enable him. God must give him both a mouth and a hand, before he can speak for Christ to take him. Yet both he must have, before he can receive, the Lord having set down to himself (as you your self acknowledg) such a method and way of giving.

The other which seems to be of more strength, and I think the strongest you bring, is this, *If the promise of Salvation were upon condition of Believing, then men should believe before they be justified; contrary to Rom. 4. 5. where it is said, God justifies the ungodly.* Now no where in Scripture Believers are called ungodly; The same almost *totidem verbis* you may read in the Doctor, vol. I. p. 170, 171.

Now for answer unto this, I d fire you to consider, what the Papists

Papists say concerning this Justification of the wicked. That wheresoever in Scripture God is said to justify the ungodly, it must be understood that he also makes the ungodly just and righteous; for otherwise the judgment of God would not be according to truth, and the Lord should do that himself which he forbids his creature to do, and abhors in his creature whenever he doth it, *Exod. 23. 7. Isa. 5. 23. Deut. 25. 1. Prov. 17. 15.* And lest you should think light of it, because it comes from them, though it is right to learn even from an Enemy, hear what the learned *Pemble* saith of this very rule cited by him. *We Embrace this rule (saith he) and the reason of it, acknowledging that where ever there is Justification, there must be Justice some way or other in the party Justified.* Sect. 1. c. 3. of Justific. The God of Truth should otherwise call darkness light, and evil good. And therefore both that Author, as also *Paras* and *Chamier*, tells us, That the Righteousness of Christ imputed to this ungodly person is the ground of this gracious sentence of God, whereby he doth absolve, acquit, and justify him. So that the Person, though he be ungodly and unrighteous in himself, and so unjustifiable, yet is he godly, just, and righteous in Christ, and through the Righteousness of Christ imputed to him justifiable. Let this then be agreed on; *i. e. 1.* That the ground of this gracious sentence of God, whereby he Justifies the ungodly must be some kind of Righteousness. And *2.* That it is the righteousness of Christ imputed to the sinner. The query then will be, Whether this Righteousness of Christ be imputed to the sinner before he doth believe, or not till he believeth? Now I think the Scriptures are very clear for the latter, that Righteousness is not imputed to the sinner till he doth believe: That very Text it self confirms it, *To him that believeth on him that justifies the ungodly, his Faith is counted for Righteousness.* It is to him that believeth that Righteousness is imputed; and again, *His Faith is counted,* &c. Take Faith how you will, it must come in to the imputation, the Imputation is not without it. So again, *Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for Righteousness,* ver. 3. When was it so accounted? Certainly when he believed: It was whilst he was in uncircumcision indeed, but not whilst he was in unbelief; *He received Circumcision (saith the Apostle) the Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, which yet he had being uncircumcised.* As he had Righteousness then, so had he Faith too, for it was a Righteousness of Faith. And as it was imputed unto him

upon believing, so shall it be imputed unto us if we believe on him who raised up *Jesus*, *ver. 24*. Hence it is called the *Righteousness of Faith*, for that it comes to be ours through faith. Faith takes it, receives it, puts it on; *The Righteousness of God by Faith*, *Phil. 3. 9*.

We answer then that place in the *Romans* thus,

1. An ungodly person may be taken either for one who is wicked, and goes impenitently on in his wickedness, never once looking after Christ; a sinner continuing in his impenitency and unbelief. Now such an ungodly person God doth not justify; for it is against both his truth and justice. *Antin. p. 110*.

2. It may be taken for one that is ungodly and unjustifiable in himself; but yet believing on Christ, is through him and his satisfaction just, and so justifiable. Such an ungodly person God doth justify; and thus *Ames*, *Paræus*, *Bishop Downam*, and those other Divines I have in their descriptions of Justification, make not a sinner simply, but a believing sinner to be the subject of Justification, or the person to be justified.

Now whereas you say. *That no where in Scripture a Believer is called ungodly*. I conceive it false, He is called so there: For who is the ungodly person spoken of there, but *Abraham*? and he was justified (as hath been shewed) when he did believe. Besides, God the object of faith Justifying, who is described there to be the Justifier of the ungodly, is said in *ver. 26*. of the foregoing Chap. to be the Justifier of him that believeth in *Jesus*. I beseech you tell me, doth not the Apostle speak of one and the same Justification in both places? Doth he not in both places describe one and the same person, the person that is justified? Him then whom he calls a Believer on Christ in one place, the same he calls an ungodly person in the other; and whom he calls an ungodly person in this, in that he styles the same a believing person. Certainly, seeing (as it is *Chap. 3. vers. 30*.) that it is one God that justifies both the Circumcision by Faith, and the Uncircumcision through faith, i.e. All that are justified, both Jew and Gentile, circumcised or uncircumcised, by or through one and the same means of faith. It must needs be that the ungodly person spoken of in the next Chap. is such an ungodly person, as hath faith, and doth believe; or else God should justify some without faith, to which the former place doth aver the contrary. That place in the *Romans* then concerning Gods justifying the ungodly, will not bear the Position you ground

ground upon it; *viz.* That sinners are justified before they do believe; or that we do not believe that we may be justified, as the Doctor expresseth it, an assertion as rotten as the foundation on which it is built; and expressly contrary to the Apostle, who tells us, *Gal. 2. 16.* that he had believed on Christ, that so he might be justified by the Faith of Christ.

Thus have I given you an account of some, and those of the main of your Arguments, both wherein they have not satisfied me concerning the Tenent you endeavoured to maintain, and wherein also they have offended me, whilst they wounded that I hold for truth through the sides of Popery and Arminianism. I shall now shew you some grounds of my belief on the contrary: first taking leave in a word to state the Question, and to set down how, and what I hold concerning it.

First then, I distinguish between both a condition and a meritorious cause, as also between it and an impulsive cause. By condition, I understand neither any thing meriting Justification at Gods hands in the least degree, nor yet any thing moving the Lord to Justifie or bestow Salvation on us.

Secondly, By Conditions I understand the restipulation or repromission in a Covenant, the Terms and Articles of Agreement in a Covenant between equals, and the thing commanded or required in a Covenant between Superiors and Inferiors, such as is the Covenant between God and man.

Thirdly, Whereas there are conditions: yet I assert them not in any ridged and legal, but in an Evangelical way. Not so, as if they were not strictly and in a ridged exactness perfectly kept, there were no hope of salvation; but so, as if that they be not in some measure sincerely observed, there is sure damnation. Mr. Ball will tell you, that *whereas in the Covenant of Nature, perfect obedience is exacted, so that if there be the least failing in any jot or tittle, and that but once, a man can never be justified thereby, nor can the breach be made up by any repentance. In the Covenant of Grace, perfect obedience is indeed required, yet so as Repentance is admitted, and sincerely accepted.* Conditions in this Evangelical way I plead for, and conceive, That God in the New Covenant doth not promise life and salvation absolutely unto his chosen, whether they believe and repent or no; but doth require from, and command them to repent and believe, if they will be partakers of the benefits purchased by his Son, and promised by himself in that his Covenant; which

The Covenant of Grace not Absolute

which that they may do, he himself of his own grace, and for his own Sons sake bestows faith and repentance on them. Nor have they a right to any actual enjoyment of these benefits until they do actually repent and believe.

The Grounds of my persuasion in this particular follow.

I. That Covenant, wherein is a mutual stipulation, is conditional. But such is the new Covenant; therefore that is conditional. As on Gods part life and salvation are promised, so on mans repentance, and faith, and perseverance therein are required, and to be promised, *Mar. 1. 15. Chap. 6. 12. Act. 2. 38. Chap. 3. 19. Chap. 20. 21. Job. 6. 28, 29. Chap. 3. 15, 16. Job. 8. 24. Rom. 10 6, 7, 8, 9. Job. 8 31. Chap. 15. 5, 6, 7, 10. Heb. 3. 6. Chap. 10. 38* He cannot see wood for trees, that doth not take notice of these Evangelical Commands, wherein performance of Gospel. conditions, and perseverance in that performance are required, they every where so abundantly occur. Choose we out one of the places named, and a little insist on it; that *Rom. 10. 9.* the rather for that in your answer to Mr. S. you make some reply thereto. *How (say you) do you prove, that Rom. 10. 9. is set down the form and tenure of the New Covenant? I deny it; The Apostles intent is, &c.*

Sir, It is clear, as Calvin notes, that the Apostle here opposeth the Righteousness of Faith to the Righteousness of Works. It is also clear, that in describing the Righteousness of Works he setteth down the very tenor and form of that Covenant, *the man that doth them shall live by them*, ver. 5. And in opposition thereunto, delivers this to be the speech of the Righteousness of Faith, *If thou confessest with thy mouth, and believest with thine heart, &c.* If then it be granted, which cannot be denied, that in these words, *The man that doth them shall live by them*, the tenor of the Covenant of Works is contained; it must needs follow by the rule of opposition, that in these words, *If thou confessest and believest, &c.* the tenor of the Covenant of Grace is also contained. Besides, when the Apostle saith, *The Word is nigh thee, &c. That is the Word of faith which we preach, that if thou confessest, &c.* What (pray you) doth he mean by the Word of Faith, but the Gospel? or what else did the Apostle preach but the Gospel? The sum of which he saith to be this, *If thou confessest, if thou believe, &c.*

Sir, That Word or Gospel which the Apostle preached, wherein he held out the Righteousness of faith, and which he set in opposition

position against the Covenant of Works; that same must needs be the Covenant of Grace. But such is the word here; the tenor whereof he saith is, *If thou confests, &c. Ergo*, it is the Covenant of Grace And whereas you say, *That the Apostles intent there is to shew Gods order and method in fulfilling the promises of the Covenant, and to describe those whom he will bring to Glory*: tho it make nothing against us; for if that were his intent, he might have his intent, and describe both the one and the other, in setting down the Covenant. (The conditions which lead to annexed promises, holding out Gods method unto us, and the counterpane of the Covenant or Conditions engraven on the heart, being the best character of a person to be glorified.) Though (I say) this makes nothing against us: yet if you consider the series of the Apostles discourse, both in the latter end of the foregoing Chapter, and in this; or if you please to consult with *Junius Parallels*, where he hath a whole Parallel about this place; *Lib. 2. Par. 16.* you shall find the Apostles intent and scope is otherwise than you say; namely, to prove unto the Jew, even out of *Moses*, that the end of the Law was not that they might be justified thereby, but that by the impossibility of keeping it, they might be driven to seek justification from Christ by faith in another Covenant; which Covenant of Faith *Moses* (though obscurely) did intimate unto them in those expressions, *Say not in thy heart, &c. The Word is nigh thee*, by which he meant no other than that Word of Faith, Gospel, or Covenant of Grace which the Apostle preached; the sum whereof was, *That if thou confests and believe, thou shalt be saved.*

Come we to some other Texts formerly alledged to prove a stipulation in the Covenant of Grace, and replied unto by you in your Sermon. That out of *Gen. 17.* touching the Covenant with *Abraham* was one. To which you say, *If any condition were required, than that of Circumcision, which ought also to be performed by all under the Gospel; so we should obtrude Judaism upon Christians.*

First, (My good Friend) Are intimations of preaching Judaism, Papisim, and Arminianism no calumnies: Consider (I pray you) how you besmear the Adversaries of your Opinion to bring an *odium* upon them:

Secondly, What you reply, serves only *ad faciendum populum*; there being no manner of Answer made unto the Argument. For whether Circumcision belong to us or no, it was required of *Abraham* and his Seed; and the soul that refused to take it, is said

to break the Covenant and was to be cut off, *ver. 14.* So that the Argument remains firm against you; yea, not at all replied unto; which is this; *The Covenant with Abraham was the Covenant of free grace: But in the Covenant with Abraham there was a Condition required of the fedarates, Abraham and his Seed: Therefore in the Covenant of free grace there is a Condition required of the Federates.*

Thirdly, As for that you say, We distinguish between the external Sign of the Covenant, and the substance of it. The one is alterable, the other remains still the same. Now Circumcision was but the external Sign of *Abrahams* part. The things or duties God did especially require of *Abraham*, were faith and sincere obedience, *Rom. 4. 3. Gen. 17. 1.* Now these belong to Christians, as much as to Jewe, and to press them on Christians is no Judaism.

Circumcision was a Sign obligatory to those which were in Covenant; or a token of the restipulation of Abraham, obliging him and his posterity to faith and obedience of the Covenant to be performed to God, saith Pareus.

Fourthly, I conceive that mandate from the external sign of Circumcision to reach to us Christians. Though not in the letter, yet in the Analogy, and by vertue of it Christians stand to be baptized themselves; also to bring their seed to partake of that Sacrament, which as the Apostle teacheth us, is our Christian Circumcision; and he that wilfully refuseth may be said to break the Covenant, as well as he that formerly refused Circumcision. The same Covenant which gave a Commandment or Word of Restipulation for that Circumcision of *Abraham* and his Seed, giveth the same commandment or Word of Justification for Baptism of Believers and our seed, saith *Mr. Cotten of New England Grounds and Ends of Infant Baptism. p. 38.*

The next places of Scripture to prove a stipulation were *Hosea 8. 10. Hosea. 2. 23.* To which you reply by Interrogation. *Is there any condition on mans part intimated here? Doth not God promise to do all? Doth he say, If you will be my people?*

1. Sir, what you mean by that expression, *Doth not God promise to do all?* I wist not, *Mr. Saltmarsh* saith, *It is enough for us to believe that Christ hath repented for us, believed for us.* But I hope you are not so far gone. If you by it understand, Gods gracious inabling of his creature to perform the conditions he himself requireth, I readily joyn with you. It is he gives us to repent and to believe as hath beed said already. But then I hope you will distinguish between Gods gift and mans duty; though the *Ability* be given of God,

God the *Exercise* of it; or *work* is mans. It is man himself that believeth and repenteth, though he receive ability from the Lord for both.

2. We answer your Demand, *Is there any condition on mans part?* Yes, that there is; namely this, *They shall be my people.* Can they be his people without dutiful subjection and obedience to him? Here is this then, that God requires of them, that if they would have him to be a God to them, to pardon them, defend them, save them, &c. then they should take him for their God, depend on him, submit to him, obey, worship and serve him, and carry themselves towards him as become his people: *Hos. 2. 23. They shall say, Thou art my God: Upon which Paræus glosseth, God saith, we are his people, making us to be his people. Our Faith and our obedience is our saying, The Lord is our God.* Nor is it material that God doth not formally condition with them, saying, *If you will be my people, &c.* The stipulation required, is no whit the less firm, when in the next Chapter the Prophet saith, *Chap. 3. 3. Only thou shalt abide for me many days; and not, if thou wilt abide for me: it was nevertheless a conjugal Compact.* The cause of this kind of expression may be either for brevities sake: or secondly, as Mr. Ball notes, God enters into Covenant with man not as his equal but as his Superiour or Sovereign, appointing man his conditions in form of commands, which it's mans duty to accept of and obey: Or 3. Which I should rather chuse, to intimate thereby his gracious purpose of giving ability to perform the Conditions, *I will put my Laws in their hearts. They shall be my people, i.e. I will not only require of them, that they know my Laws, and obey me as becomes my People; but by my Grace, I will cause it to be wrought within them.* Whether way you take it, either for Gods command injoyning them to be his People; or for his promise to make them his People, it is not much maerial; this still remains either way, that they were to be his People. And this we have, even from the most absolute Promises, those of taking the stony heart away, giving a heart of flesh, a new heart, circumcising the heart, writing the Law on the heart; which admit not, as I conceive, any antecedent condition, yet do they clearly shew that these things are required. This new heart is

required, the writing the Law on the heart is required, and so of the rest: God doth require them in his People, and without men have them, they cannot be the people of God, nor expect Salvation from God.

These things, Sir, perswade me, notwithstanding all that you have hitherto replied, to adhere still to what I have formerly conceived and delivered concerning these Texts; *viz.* That they do hold out a stipulation in the Covenant, and then it will be conditional. Now because this work is swollen bigger by the one half already than (when I set pen to paper) I intended it should have been, I shall briefly add some more Arguments, and draw toward a close; And because we are upon stipulations in the Covenant, add we an Argument or two of that nature.

1. That Covenant which is mandatory as well as promissory, and contains a Law as well as a promise, that Covenant hath a stipulation which they must subscribe to, who will be federates and Covenanters therein; for whenever the Lord annexeth a command unto promise, the Promise is not absolute but conditional: there is something required in the command of him who will enjoy the benefit of the Promise. Now the New Covenant is of this nature; it is not a meer Promise (as some would have it) but a Law as well as a Promise, and therefore called by the Apostle, *The Law of Faith*, Rom. 3. 27. *The Law of Faith is that Doctrine which doth require faith to the obtaining of that Righteousness which is freely imputed, saith Paræus. Par. & Mart in loc. That is the Law of works which teacheth that Righteousness is to be obtained by Works, but the Law of Faith teacheth, it is to be hoped for from the mercy of God alone, saith Martyr. The Doctrine teaching Righteousness by Faith, is that which the Word of the Gospel doth bind us to if we will be saved, saith Bernard in his Thesaur. The Condition which offereth and promiseth Salvation, is this Condition, If we believe. Wilson in his Dictionary on the words.*

2. That Covenant which man is forbidden to break, commanded to keep, and wherein man is tied and bound unto God, that Covenant must needs have conditions and restipulations on mans part; for it is in regard of the things required from man; that
men

man is said to break or keep, or be bound by the Covenant. But such is the New Covenant. *Abraham's* was such, *My Covenant shall thou keep*, Gen. 17. 9. *David's* was such (though you averred the contrary in your Sermon) *Psal. 132. 12. If thy Children will keep my Covenant.* Such was *Israel's*, *Ezek. 20. 37. I will make you to pass under the Rod, and bring you into the land of the Covenant:* And what Covenant doth he mean but that mentioned, *Ezek. 36. 26. and Hys. 2. ?* The places considered seem to me to hold out one and the same. Such is also that administration of it under which we are. The Romans were, *Rom. 6. 20. Free from righteousness*, before they believed on Christ, and entered into Covenant with him; but after they were Baptized into Christ, they were, ver. 18. 19, 20. *Servants unto Righteousness.* The Style of God's People formerly was, they were Covenant keepers, *Psal. 25. 10. Psal. 103. 17.* And is it not as proper to them now, as it was then? May not the People of God under the Gospel be guilty of breach of Covenant, and that not only in regard of their Covenants with men, nor yet in regard of those necessary engagements which occasionally they make unto the Lord, but in regard of their Baptism, and that solemn Covenant between God and them, which Baptism doth seal. See Dr. *Preston N. Coven. p. 458. 459. 500. &c.* I have not quite forgotten Mr. *Perkins* Catechism, which I learned when I was a child, where I was taught in the fifth Principle expounded, to answer this Question, *How comes it to pass that many after their Baptism for a long time feel not the effect and fruit of it, and some never?* Thus Answered, *The fault is not in God who keeps his Covenant, but the fault is in themselves, in that they do not keep the condition of the Covenant, to receive Christ by faith, and repent of all their sins.* And a little after, *How if a man never keep the Condition to wh. ch he bound himself in Baptism?* Answer, *His damnation shall be greater, because he breaks his Vow made unto God,* Mr. *Perkins* you see teacheth Conditions in the New Covenant, in regard of which it may be kept or broken by us Christians.

3. This brings to my mind another Argument; That Covenant wherein a Promise is required of the federates, which Promise they do also seal to God in receiving of the Covenant Seal, that Covenant hath a restitution; But such is the new Covenant. For the confirmation of the Minor, I desire you to consider how in

the Primitive times grown Persons were required to profess their Repentance and Faith in Christ before they were admitted unto Baptism. Repent (saith Peter, *Acts 2.*) and be baptized: Whence also it is called the *Baptism of Repentance*; *Mark 1. 4.* *Acts 19. 4.* And John is said to Baptize men unto Repentance, *Mat. 3. 11.* So when the Eunuch desired Baptism of Philip, *Acts 8. 36, 37.* saying, *what doth hinder me to be Baptized?* Philip replies, *That if he believed with all his heart, he might*; whereupon followed both his confession of Faith and Baptism. The Papist also requires those whom he Baptized to bring forth fruits worthy amendment of Life. From which places Zanchy and Piscator collect, that Faith and Repentance and new obedience, were required of all those grown persons who were baptized, they were to make profession of their repentance and faith, and to make Promise of new Obedience. Take Piscator's note upon *Matth. 3.* *Baptism is to be administered to no person that is of years, unless he shall first of all make a confession of sins, and of faith in Christ, and withal a Promise of leading a holy life.* *Mat. 3. Obs. ex ver. 6, 8 10.* These professions were afterward for the ease of the party to be baptized, turned into Interrogations and Answers: The Minister demanding of the party to be baptized, *Dost thou believe in God?* the party was wont to answer, *I do believe.* The Minister again inquiring, *Dost thou renounce the Devil?* &c. he replied, *I do renounce.* Which Answer when Infants could not make of themselves, they had Parents and Sponsors who made it for them. Thus was there a formal stipulation required of grown persons at their first admission into Covenant and the administration of the seal of the Covenant to him.

Farther, As before baptism, grown persons did thus profess and promise, so by being baptized did they seal. For this Seal of Baptism, as it is Gods seal to us, assuring us of remission and other benefits promised in the Covenant: so is it also the Christians Seal unto God, whereby he seals the promise of Repentance, Faith and new Obedience: Hence are they said to be baptized into Christ; into his Death, into the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

To be baptized into any ones name is to be consecrated to his Worship; so that he is named from him as from his Lord, and that he dedicate himself wholly to his service, saith Piscator. Pis. in Mat. 28. v. 19. And learned Zinchie having at large exprest the same in several particulars, doth briefely sum up all. Baptism is a note and mark whereby we do protest that we will observe the Conditions of that Covenant which in Christ is established between God and us. In cap. 5. ad Ephes. de Bapt. cap 3. Thes. 37. Baptism is (saith Bishop Davenant) A Covenant made with God of leading a more holy life, therefore we must take care that what was once Sacramentally done in Baptism, may be performed truly throughout our whole life. Dav. in Colos. 2. v. 12. Cor. 2. As Souldiers (saith Martyr) swear in the name of the General and are so bound to him, that it is not lawfull for them afterwards to be conversant in the enemies tents, if they do, the offence is capital: So by Baptism we are obliged unto Christ, and we swear that we will not afterwards at any time revolt to the Devil. Martyr in Rom 6. 3. So also Paræus, It is known from the Catechism, That we are baptized in the name of the Trinity, because we are bound in the name of God to faith, in, to Worship and obedience of God; and we do also promise again these things unto God. We are baptized into the death of Christ in a double respect; first, in respect of God, in as much as he doth by the Seal of Baptism, give and seal to us the benefits of the death of Christ. Secondly in respect of our selves, by promising again faith to believe these so great benefits of Christ, and the mortifying of sin by the power of the death of Christ, that it reign not over us any more. Paræus in Loc. With these forementioned doth also Mr Byeld concur, who tells us, that Baptism is a Bond that tieth us to the desires and endeavours after the beginning and finishing of our death to sin and Spiritual life, Byfield in Col. 2. v. 12. according to these Authors sense of the places forenamed. Baptism sealeth our promise of Repentance, Faith and new Obedience to God, as well as his promise of remission unto us. It is our pledge, our Covenant money, and military oath, whereby we do tie and bind our selves to the service of the most High: which I cannot possibly conceive how it should be such if there were no restipulation, or repromission in the Covenant, as you maintain.

Thus

Thus much at present concerning Restipulation in the Covenant; pass we on to some other Arguments: and because I remember you told me, that I had in my Sermons a number of Citations out of the Old Testament, you shall hear some more of the Arguments I used then; for some of them I have set down already.

To what hath been said add then, Gods mercies are to be obtained in Gods way, that way and manner which God hath from eternity pitched on therein to bring men to the enjoyment of these mercies: But God hath from all eternity purposed to give Remission, Justification, Adoption, &c. as through Christ (for he hath *predestinated us to the Adoption of children, through Jesus Christ*, Ephes. 1. 5, 7.) so through faith in Christ. and in a way of repentance, Rom. 3. 25, 28. chap. 8. 28. Acts 13. 38, 39, 48. chap. 5. 31. chap. 11. 18. Therefore till men actually repent and believe, they cannot actually partake of remission, Adoption, Justification, and those other benefits and purchases of Christs passion.

Again, those mercies which the Prophets and Apostles propose and promise unto men, not absolutely, but on terms of Repentance and Faith: they are not absolutely, but upon performance of the proposed terms to be expected; but the faithful messengers of God, both in the Old and New Testament, do both proffer and promise remission in this manner.

Look into the Sermons of the Prophets, and we shall find in their fullest and highest descriptions of free grace and offers of mercy, they still require repentance of men. So *Isai. 1. Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow.* But when? when they should seriously set upon the practice of Repentance: for so in the words foregoing, *Wah ye, cease to do evil, &c. Come now and let us reason.* No parley at all before this to be expected. So
chap.

chap. 55. a place much insisted on by Dr. Crisp for to prove the absolute freeness now in hand. There are many things required, as thirsting, coming, hearing, seeking, calling, forsaking of sin, and turning unto God. So the other Prophets, Jer. 3. 12, 13, 14. Ezek. 18. 31, 32. chap. 33. 11. chap. 36. 26, 27. Zach. 1. 3. Now whereas you told me, That these were proofs out of the Old Testament, I hope you neither deny proofs thence to be authentical, nor yet the Prophets then to have been Preachers of free grace. The Covenant (I hope) was for substance the same then that it is now; not a conditional one then, and not absolute one now. *The Fathers of the Old Testament (saith Luther) before Christ appeared in the flesh, had him in the Spirit, believed in him, and were saved by him as we are, according to the saying, Jesus Christ is one yesterday, to day, and shall be the same for ever. Luther in Galat. c. 4. v. 2. Gal. 3. vers. 19 Pemb. vind. fid. 138. p. Treat. of Justif. Sect. 4 cap. 1.*

Come to the New Testament, and we shall find that salvation was held out in the same manner then. Christ and his fore-runners were Preachers of Repentance: yea, the Commission for preaching of the Gospel, which is still on record, doth shew how it was then, and is still to be published, not without, but on terms of Repentance, Luke 24. 47. *That repentance and remission of sin should be preached to all Nations.* The rule of which their commission the Apostles observed, as they themselves tell us, *Testifying both to Jews and Gentiles repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, Acts 20. 21.* Nay, it would be no difficult task to pick out most conditional Particles out of their, and our Saviours Sermons, &c. *scil. Mark 9. 23. Acts 8. 37 εἰ, Matth. 6. 14. Rom. 10. 9. εἰ καὶ ὥς modo, Coloss. 1. 23. εἰ καὶ ὥς, Matth. 6. 15. John 8. 24. Matth. 18. 3. εἰ ὅτι, Mark 11. 26. καὶ ὥς, Mark 5. 36. If, but if, unless, except only sin. modo, dum, dummodo, were conditional, when I learned my Grammer.*

3. The Office of the Ministry, what is it for, but to prepare people for mercy by working something in them that may fit them for the receipt of the benefits promised in the New Covenant. As John was so are they to be Christs

Har -

Harbingers, and are to make ready a people prepared for the Lord Luke 1. 17. To preach to them that they might be saved, 1. Thess. 2. 16. To open their eyes and to bring them from darkness to light, and from the kingdom of Satan unto God, that they may receive remission of sins, &c. Acts 25. 18. Thou hast ascended up on high, thou hast lead captivity captive, and hast received gifts for men, even for the rebellious, that the Lord God may dwell among them, Psal 68. 18. On which Dr. Crisp thus glosseth. Vol. 2. p. 410. Who is that Theus? The Rebellious saith the Text: And p. 412. The Holy Ghost doth not say that the Lord takes Rebellious persons and sins and prepares them by Sanctification, and then when they are fitted, he will come and dwell with them; but even then, without any intermission, without any stop, even when they are rebellious the Lord Christ hath received gifts for them, that the Lord God may dwell among them: Thus the Doctor. But certainly the Apostle Paul was more acquainted with the mind of the Holy Ghost than Dr. Crisp: now he, Ep^les 4. 8. alledging this of the Psalmist, openeth it far otherwise, and delivereth it, so as to me it seemes full for the confirmation of that we have in hand. When (saith he) he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive and gave gifts to men: I hope he gave no other than what he received for them. Now what gave he? It followes, He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers: and for what end? For the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we come, &c. He did not then receive this gift, that though they were rebellious, the Lord God might dwell among them whilst they remained so, as the Doctor avers. But on the contrary, he received and gave abroad these gifts of the Ministerial function, that thereby people might be taken off their rebellious principles, and broken of their rebellious practices, and fitted for the communion with the Most High: The sum is, the Ministers of the Word are sent on this business to prepare people for the Lord, for remission and salvation; therefore there is something required of them, some work to be wrought in them, on them before they can actually partake of remission or salvation from the Lord, or enjoy communion with the Lord.

4. That which these Ministers of the Gospel have directed sinners to do for the obtaining of Remission, Justification, and Salvation, that in order of nature is to be done before Remission, Justification and Salvation can actually be obtained : But the Ministers of the Gospel have directed sinners to repent and believe for the obtaining of, &c. *Acts* 2. 38. *chap.* 3. 19. *chap.* 16. 30, 31. *Gal.* 2. 16. Nor was it Remission or Justification in *cognoscendo* only, that they were directed to seek in this way of Faith and Repentance. Can any imagine that the meaning of that Query of the Jaylor, *Sirs, what shall I do to be saved?* should be no more than this, What shall I do to be certified and assured of my Salvation? Besides, that Justification, that *Paul* did himself, and directed others to seek by Faith, *Rom.* 3. 28. *Gal.* 2. 16. was such in which Works have no hand. But to Justification in *cognoscendo*, or in *foro conscientia*, to the evidencing to us, and assuring us that we are justified, Works do concur, *James* 2. 16, 24. *A man is justified* (assured of Justification) *by Works, and not by Faith only.* So that the other Justification must be of another and different kind, Works being wholly excluded from having any thing to do therein.

5. They who are in an estate of Wrath and Death until they do believe, and then upon their believing pass out of that estate into an estate of life; they are not actually justified till they do believe: But the Elect are in such an estate of Wrath and Death till they do actually believe *Ephes.* 2. *Children of wrath, even as others*, *Tit.* 3. 3. and then when they believe, they pass out of that estate, *1 Joh.* 3. 14. *We know we are passed from death to life.* Under the power of death we were then, otherwise we could not have passed from it. And when passed we from it? the same Apostle in his Gospel tells us, *Joh.* 5. 24. *chap.* 3. *ult.* in one of which places he assures us, that *he that heareth and believeth, is passed*: and in the other, *He that believeth not, the wrath of God still abides on him*; which terms of *passing* and *abiding*, clearly shew that all the Elect are, and continue actually in that woful estate, until they do believe. I hope you will not say, they pass in their own sense and apprehension, and so are children of wrath according to their apprehensions. The Apostle saith, *They are children of wrath even as others*: and certainly others are not only sensibly and appearingly so, nay, perhaps neither of these ways, but really so. For my part, I conceive no difference between a Vessel of Election and a Vessel of Wrath, but only in regard of God's purpose and Christ's purchase, which till it be brought into act, doth make no real change in the party's state and condition.

6. Until Men come actually to have Christ, to be united unto him, and one with him, they cannot partake of Justification, nor have any right thereto, 1 John 5. 12. *He that hath the Son hath life, he that hath not the Son, hath not life.* But until Men have Faith they have not Christ, nor are united to him, for by Faith they receive him, John 1. 12. *Go to him,* John 6. 35, 37. *Feed on him; dwell in him, and he in them,* John 6. 40, 56. *By faith they live in him, and he in them,* Gal. 2. 20. *By faith he dwelleth in their hearts,* Ephes. 3. 17. *Ergo,* Until Men have Faith, and by Faith do actually believe on him, they cannot partake of Justification through him, John 3. 36.

I remember that when in a private Conference I pressed some of these places of Scripture, instead of answering to them, you demanded, *Whether the Elect had no benefit by Christ, nor right to Christ before they did believe?* To which I replied,

1. That though there be a purpose in God to give salvation to them, and a purchase of it by Christ for them, yet had they no right thereunto until they had faith.

2. That they might have benefit by Christ before they had right to Christ, as in the instant of their Conversion, when the Spirit of Christ did work faith and repentance in them. That first Benefit (they had, I conceive) in order of nature, though not in time, before they had right, it being the very conveyance of right over to them, and stating them therein, must precede their having of right, or otherwise they should have right before they had it. This you told me then was *gross nonsense*; and since you have averred in Pulpit, that *to say Men have benefit and not right, is palpable nonsense.*

But, 1. Sir, Whether nonsense or no, what is it you say to the places cited? These Texts tell me plainly, that unless I have Faith, I have not Christ, and that unless I have Christ I cannot have Life, no nor Right to, or Interest in it; unless a Man may have Right to, and Interest in Life through Christ, and yet for all not live, but perish everlastingly: which I think will be worse than nonsense to aver: So that the Argument remains firm and unanswered.

2. For your Crimination, though you might have dealt more fairly, and produced the manner of our asserting it, as well as the assertion it self; yet we must be content to take what you give, and as you give it, and shall cast it up into the Sackel to the other Legacies you have bestowed on us; as Arminianism, Papism, Judaism, absolute Contradictions and weak Evasions, &c.

3. For the gross and palpable Nonsense it self, Benefit and not Right. I must profess unto you, that as gross and palpable as it is, my dull Pate doth not yet apprehend it. All the while the Father lives, the Child hath benefit by his Father's means, but what right he hath thereto I know not: the Coats he wears, the Food he eats, are not his own by right, I think, but his Father's; yea, when the Father dies and gives a Legacy to his Child to be paid at such an age, until the Child come to that age it cannot challenge the Legacy or Portion given him by his Father, nor dispose of it, if he die before, yet hath he benefit thereby; if he hath *jus ad rem*, a right to the thing, he hath not *jus in re*, a right in the thing, until that period of time, notwithstanding the Donation of his Father. But to come yet nearer to the matter in hand. Suppose that some poor Woman cast in Prison for Debt, where she is like to perish, should haply meet with a rich Friend, who pitying her sad condition, and taking an affection to her, should procure her enlargement out of Prison, intending to wed and marry her: I hope here it would be no nonsense to say, that this Woman had benefit by this intended Husband, before she had right to him, and interest in him: for, till the Match or Contract she cannot have any right in him at all. The case is ours, we are indebted to God, and in Prison too, the Lord by his Spirit delivering us, doth make us his heavenly Bride. This first benefit, our delivering out of bonds, we must have in some measure from Christ, in order of Nature, before we can give our consent to the Match, and by Faith take the Lord Jesus for our Husband. May we not say in this case, that we have benefit? viz. the grand benefit of Regeneration by him, before we have right to him? Is it nonsense to say so? I am sure Mr. Thomas Goodwin writes something after this manner, (*Christ set forth in his Death, &c.* p. 28.) *The promises of forgiveness are not as the pardons of a Prince, which merely contain an expression of his Royal Word for pardoning; so as we in seeking of it, do rest upon, and have to do only with his Word and Seal, which we have to shew for it: but God's Promises of Pardon are made in his Son, and are as if a Prince should offer to pardon a Traitor upon Marriage with his Child, whom in, and with that Pardon he offers in such a relation, so as all that would have pardon, must first seek out for his Child: And thus it is in the matter of believing; the reason of which is, because Christ is the grand Promise, in whom all the Promises are Yea and Amen, 2 Cor. 1. 20. The Interest in an Heiress Lands goes with her person, and with the relation of Marriage to her; so all the Promises hang on Christ, and without him, there is no interest to be had in them.* So Mr. Reynolds Life

of Christ, p. 466. tells me, *That till there be this consent on our side, it is but a Wooing, there is no Marriage, no Covenant made.* Pag. 478. *That our Union and Communion with Christ, is on our part the work of Faith, whose Office it is to unite to Christ and gain possession of him.* Yea, Luther also on Gal. 2. 20. *Faith therefore must be purely taught, namely, that thou art so entirely joined to Christ, as that thou may'st say, I am one with Christ, his Righteousness and Victory are mine, &c. For by Faith we are joined so together, that we are become one Flesh and one Bone. So that this Faith doth couple Christ and me more near together, than the Husband is coupled to his Wife.* And Dr. Preston's *New Coven.* p. 458. avers the same.

Sir, these Men know how to write sense; now they tell us, that our right comes through our Marriage with Christ, and that Spiritual Match is not made up, until we believe, which be the two main Pieces of that you call gross Nonsense. For, as for the third, that we cannot believe till God for Christ's sake vouchsafe us that benefit, that they all maintain it, I need not tell you. In fine, your Nonsense bespeaks you in this Argument, which perhaps may puzzle both your senses and intellectuals solidly to answer.

All that be united unto Christ, and quickned by him, before they have right to him, do receive special benefits from him before they have right to him: But all the Elect are united unto Christ and quickned by him, before they have right to him, or to salvation through him: *Ergo*, All the Elect do receive special benefits by Christ, before they have right to him, or to salvation through him. Or, All that have union before they have right, have benefit before they have right; But all the Elect have union before they have right; *Ergo*, All the Elect have benefit before they have right.

But we have right to those benefits (say you) by vertue of God's Largess and Donation. The same I also find in Dr. Ames, *Cor.* p. 127.

But this I conceive to hold true only in absolute Grants; for if the Gift or Grant be conditional, then is there a right unto the benefit granted, when that condition is wrought in the Legatee, and not before. Swynborn in his *Treatise of Testaments*, p. 150. tells us, *That if the Testator give his Daughter an Hundred Pounds, if she marry with advice and approbation of her Uncle, in case the party marry without advising with her Uncle about it, she loseth her right to the Legacy given her; (which by the way, may shew the weakness of that Argument that is taken from the word Testament, which some use against Conditions: as if Conditions could not stand with a Testamentary Disposition.)* Now such is God's grant
of

of Salvation: it is made in Christ, it is made in him unto Believers; it is not made to sinners, as sinners, as some aver, but to repenting and believing sinners, *John. 6 38, 39, 40. This is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son and believeth on him, have everlasting life.* The Grant being made unto us as Believers, I conceive we have not right unto the benefit granted until we do believe. Sure I am, we cannot have right, but by and through our union to him; which union being an inestimable benefit, we cannot have right before we have benefit.

7. Because you are so ready to charge your Adversaries with Nonsense and Contradictions, let us mind you of the old Rule, *He that accuseth another of dishonesty, must look well to himself*: and let the inconsequences which necessarily follow from your Doctrin be our last Argument. I beseech you therefore to read me those Riddles your Tenents seem to me to contain; and to lead me out of those Mazes and Meanders which I think your Positions lead unto, at least to deliver your self out of them; for perhaps my senses may not lead me to follow your clue, unless I see better Solutions than I have seen or heard from you hitherto. I beseech you tell me then,

1. How there can be *Many, yea, or any true Believers who were never humbled*, when yet all Men must see their Righteousness dross and dung, must be schooled by the Law to know their need of Christ, before they can or will make out unto him?

2. How the same Man may be actually reconciled to God, have Wrath removed from him, and be beloved of God with the love of complacency, and yet at the same time in regard of the same evil works, be an enemy unto God, a child of wrath, and have wrath abiding on him? *See this distinction of Complacency and Compassion confirmed by Rutherford his Survey of Antinomianism.*

3. How the same Man may be actually justified and quickned, and yet actually dead in regard of the same sins, at the same time?

4. How the same Man at the same time can be a Member of Christ, one in him, and united to him, as he must be who is actually justified, and a Member also of the Devil, as he cannot but be who still remains an ungodly, impenitent, and unbelieving person?

5. How Faith in the Work of Justification serves for any farther use than to assure us, that we are justified, seeing it doth not concur to the essence and being of it, or to the constituting of us in a state justifiable? and how we are said to be justified by Faith and not by Works, when Works assure us of our being justified as well as Faith.

6. How

6. How in the Petition, *Forgive us our Debts*, we can pray for any thing more than assurance of Pardon, when actual Pardon is passed long before? And how Sins can be actually pardoned before they be committed, and the guilt removed before it is contracted?

7. How God, who promiseth pardon to Believers only, and condemneth thousands for their impenitency and unbelief, can without blemish of his Honour, Truth, and Justice, give pardon to any in his impenitency and unbelief?

8. How a Man can be said to be bound by Covenant, to keep or break the Covenant, when yet in the Covenant there are no Conditions on Man's part required to be performed?

9. Why it doth not follow from your Tenents, that a Man may be actually justified and saved without Faith, when yet you maintain actual Justification before Faith, and Faith to be required not to the essence of it, or interesting of persons in it, but only to the assuring them of their interest therein?

10. Why it follows not also from them, that Christians may live as they list, seeing you hold, that no Conditions are on their part required, so that they cannot break the Covenant? Whether Dr. Preston dares the Believer to sin if he can, I yet find not; but this I find, That he holds that the Believer may both sin, and by sinning may break the Covenant, as you may find in his Treatise of the *New Covenant*, p. 458, 459, 460, &c.

These are some of the many (for more might be named) straits and intricacies, your Positions lead your self and your followers into; out of which, how you will rid your self I wot not: but sure I am, that your Solutions hitherto given, do yield no manner of real satisfaction, not only, not to my self, but not to any other of your godly and intelligent Auditors, that I have yet met with.

Toward the close of your Sermon, you ushered in your Authorities with this Objection, *But many good Divines call it a Conditional Covenant.*

But, Sir, you are meal mouthed in the very Objection; for *not only many*, but *the most part of Divines* call it so. All that I have ever yet met with, Dr. Crisp, Mr. Saltmarsh, and your self excepted. As for those Authors you bring, I shall by and by shew your foul play in citing some of them, and your mistake of others; and discover most, if not all of them to be on my side, and to be only against meritorious Conditions. The like mincing you used in a passage in the beginning of your Sermon; viz. *That some good Di-*

Divines say, That Faith and Repentance are the way to Glory. Where- as if you be pleased to rub your Poll, I believe you may call to mind, not only that some, but most good Divines call these Conditions, and say as much of good Works as you here allow to Faith; namely, that they are *via ad regnum*, the way to the Kingdom, tho' not *Causa regnandi*, the cause of reigning. I am sure Mr. Perkins, Dr. Preston, Bishop Davenant, and most others I have read, do call them so. But you are politick in these Expressions; for thereby you would per- swade your hearers, that you had many on your side; like some Travellers, who passing on in solitary ways, keep a whistling and a hooping, as if they had a great deal of company, whereas alas they are either wholly alone, or at most have but one or two Com- panions.

Now, Sir, for your Reply to this Objection, we shall refer it to the close of all, and at present shall look into the Authors you bring, and see whether they stand for the Opinion for which you cited them, or rather against it, as shall be made to appear; and then shall add some others to them.

You begin with the Fathers, but there you are sparing in your Citations; you tell us the Question was rarely agitated then. But you might have said, that the Fathers, if they faulted in any thing about the Matter in controversy, it was in giving too much to Faith, Repentance and Good Works, by their hyperbolical commendati- ons of them, stiling them meritorious, and the like; as both Mr. Gataker in his *Rejoinder to Mr. Saltmarsh*, p. 53. and Bishop Da- nant, *de Justit. Actual. cap. 53.* Men better vers'd in the Fathers than you or I, will tell you, That you bring out of *Augustin*, makes not at all against Conditions in the Covenant, but against the Power of Free Will, asserted by *Pelagius*. The same Author will tell you,

He that made thee without thee, will not save thee without thee (as I have often heard out of Pulpits when I was a Scholar.) And whom- soever he draweth, he draweth him being willing. Our Faith distinguish- eth the just from the unjust, not by the Law of Works, but of Faith it self. Christ is not awake in him in whom Faith doth sleep. The Justifica- tion by the Faith of Jesus Christ hath been given, is given, and shall be given to Believers, before, under, and after the Law. By Faith we find that which the Jews have lost. And elsewhere, answering the Objecti- on of the *Pelagians*, from the command of Faith and Repentance, whereby they would prove, that we had power to do them, else the command of them would be to no purpose, he saith, *By commanding,*
he

he (God) doth admonish us to do what we can, and to beg for that which we are not able to do. Know, O Man (saith he in another place) by the Precept, what thou oughtest to have; in the Reproof, that 'tis through thy own fault that thou hast it not; in the Prayer, learn from whence thou may'st receive that which thou would'st have, De Cor. & gra. c. 3. He shews in another place, in what respect the Apostle saith, The Justification of Life came upon all Men; Not because all Men do believe in Jesus Christ, but because no Man is justified except he do believe in him. It is therefore said, all Men, that it might not be thought that any one might be saved by any other means whatsoever, but by him, De Nat. & Grat. c. 41. Yea, this Champion of Free Grace, hath so many high, yea, haply over-high Commendations of Faith, that out of him Bellarmine produceth not one or two, but many Citations to prove a meritorious causality of Faith in the Work of Justification, as you may see in his first Book de Justific. c. 17.

2. Prosper I have not, yet by the Allegations I have read, cited out of him, I cannot conceive that Author to be against Conditions, but rather for them. I shall name a Sentence or two.

Faith is the Foundation of Righteousness, which no Good Works go before, but from which all do proceed; from thence (i. e. from the Doctrine of the Apostles) every one doth receive Life, which Faith alone doth bring forth.

3. Add to Prosper, Jerom in Psalm 5. Therefore thou shalt besprinkle me with this Hyssop, when thou shalt pour upon me the vertue of his Blood, when Christ shall dwell in me by Faith. And Moses distinguished in Leviticus between the Righteousness of Faith and Deeds, that the one is by Works, the other only by the credulity of Faith.

4. So Ambrose According to the purpose of Grace it is so decreed by God, that the Law ceasing, the Grace of God should require Faith alone to Salvation. And this Law (to wit, of the Spirit) doth give liberty, requiring Faith alone.

5. Chrysostom, as I find him cited by Bishop Downham, Thou obtainest Righteousness, not by sweat and labour, but receivest it by gift from above, bringing one thing only from within; viz. to believe. Nothing therefore in us doth concur to the Act of Justification, but only Faith; in Rom. 1. 17. and again in Rom. 3. 27. What is the Law of Faith? to save by Grace: Here he sheweth the power of God, that he hath not only saved, but justified, and brought to glory, and that not requiring works, but seeking Faith only.

6. Theodoret, cited by the same Author. Our Lord Christ hath by his Blood procured our Salvation, Solam a nobis fidem exigens, requir-
ring

ring of us Faith alone; in Romans, Chap. 3. Verse 25.

7. Theophylact, in Rom. 4. 5. Doth he that is to be justified bring any thing? Faith only. By these I hope it doth sufficiently appear, That the Fathers held not Redemption to be absolute, as if nothing were required from us in regard of Application; but on the contrary, that Faith was required of us if we would be partakers of the Salvation purchased; that it was required of us before our actual Justification, and did concur thereto.

Pass we from these to later Writers, among whom, let *Martin Luther* be the first. Now it is true, that in the place you cited, he saith, *The Promises of the Law are conditional, but the Promises of the New Testament have no such conditions, nor require any thing of us, nor depend upon any Conditions of our worthiness.* But here I conceive he excludes *meritorious Conditions*, partly, because he expresseth himself very cautelously, saying, *No such Conditions, and no Conditions of our worthiness.* And also because he doth elsewhere often aver, that something is required of us. I might here mind you of what *Chemnicus* saith in the place before cited, who being a *Lutheran*, could not but be better acquainted with *Luther's* Tenents than you or I; namely, that *Luther* was not against *Preparations of Order*, but only *Preparations of Merit*; and for proof of it, cites him on the third Chapter to the *Galatians*, where we find, *vers. 30.* this passage, *The use of the Law is to terrifie and fright to Christ, who is the end of the Law for Righteousness.* And *vers. 2.* *Christ's coming profits neither the careless nor the desperate, but only such who have been tormented and terrified with the Law for a time, and now with sure trust come to Christ.* Which passages do clearly shew, that he held, there ought to be a work of the Law upon the heart before its close with Christ, not to make it worthy of Christ, but to make it long and gasp after Christ. I might tell you also, How in a Letter written to *Mr. Gasper Guttel*, and translated by *Mr. Rutherford*, the same *Martin Luther* vehemently inveighs against those who would have the Doctrin of Grace to be preached in the first place, and afterwards the Revelation of Wrath, calling it a *New Method*, a *Curious Crotchet*, and the broachers of it *jugling Gipsies*; and averreth expressly, that the *Apostles method*, *Rom. 1. 2, 3.* was directly opposite thereto, which was first to denounce the Wrath of God from Heaven, and make all the World sinners and guilty before God; then when they see this, to teach them farther how they may obtain grace and be justified. As also that notable place on *Gal. 2. 16.* *The true*

way to Christianity is this, that a Man do first acknowledge himself by the Law to be a sinner. A little after, When a Man is thus taught and instructed by the Law, then he is terrified and humbled, then he seeth indeed the greatness of his sin, and cannot find in himself one spark of the Law of God; therefore he justifieth God in his Word, and confesseth that he is guilty of Death and Eternal Damnation. The first part then of Christianity is the Preaching of Repentance, and the Knowledge of Ourselves. And some few Lines after, The Law doth nothing else but utter sin, terrifie and humble, and by this means prepareth us to Justification, and driveth us to Christ. And about two Leaves after, Being thus terrified by the Law, the Man utterly despaireth of his own strength, he looks about, and sigheth for the help of a Mediator and Saviour. Here then cometh in good time the healthful Word of the Gospel, and saith, Son, thy sins are forgiven thee, believe in Jesus Christ crucified for thy sins. Like to which he hath another passage, The true Office of the Law, which can be never enough magnified, is to shew us our sins, to humble us, kill us, bring us down to Hell, that we may be justified, Cha. 3. vers. 23. ad finem.

These Sayings of Luther, Sir, do fully assure me, that Luther held a Necessity of Legal Sorrow and Humiliation in Persons to be justified, and that to prepare them for Justification, which is directly against the Second Position of your former Sermons, concerning the Absoluteness of the Gospel, wherein you pleaded what you could, against the Necessity of such Legal Sorrow, and Humiliation.

But pass we over these, and consult we Luther about that necessary mean of Faith; Let the Question be, Whether in the Gospel Faith be not required to the actual enjoyment of Justification, and Remission, and to the obtaining of a right thereto, and interest therein? Or whether we may have a right to, and interest in, or actual enjoyment of these Benefits without Faith, or before Faith? We will not go beyond his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians for the discovering of his mind herein; and begin we where we left, Chap. 2. ver. 16. Here is to be noted, that these three, Faith, Christ, and Acceptation, or Imputation must be joyned together; Faith taketh hold on Christ, and hath him present, as a Ring doth a Precious Stone; and whosoever shall be found having this confidence in Christ apprehended in the heart, him will God account for Righteous. This is the mean, and this is the merit whereby we attain the Remission of Sins and Righteousness. So on vers. 20. of the

the same Chapter, a place cited already, he teacheth, that it is through Faith we are united to Christ, and come to call the Benefits we have by him, ours, cap. 3. 13. about the middle. *Forasmuch then as Christ reigns by his Grace in the Hearts of the Faithful, there is no Sin, no Death, nor Curse. But where Christ is not known, there all these things do still remain; Therefore all they that believe not, do lack this inestimable Benefit, and glorious Victory.* And on ver. 14. *We are all accursed before God, before we know Christ; and there is no other way to avoid the Curse, but to believe.* A little after, *This Gift of the Spirit, we receive not by any other Merits than by Faith alone.* Ver. 26. *Faith in Christ maketh us the Children of God.* And Verse 28. comparing our believing to the looking on the brazen Serpent, saith thus, *This is true Faith concerning Christ, and in Christ, whereby we are made Members of his Body, Flesh of his Flesh, and Bone of his Bone. In him therefore we live, move, and have our being; Christ and our Faith must be thoroughly joyned together.* Verse 29. *If ye be Christ's, then are you Abraham's Seed; that is to say, If ye believe, and be baptized into Christ; If ye believe, I say, &c. then are ye the children of Abraham, not by Nature, but by Adoption.* Yea, in the place first cited, with which we shall conclude this Testimony, cha. 2. 16. *Because thou believest in me (saith the Lord) and thy Faith layeth hold on Christ, whom I have freely given unto thee, that he might be thy Mediator and High Priest, therefore be thou justified and righteous. Wherefore God doth accept or account us as righteous only for our Faith in Christ. Because we do apprehend Christ by Faith, all our sins now are no sins; But where Christ and Faith be not, there is no remission or covering of sins, but meer imputation of sin and condemnation.*

I hope, Sir, in those places Luther speaks plainly enough to the purpose in hand, and doth sufficiently declare his belief in this particular to be, that Faith is required to our Justification, and that to the obtaining of it, that it doth marry us to Christ, and so state us in a right unto his Benefits, that till we have this Faith, we are accursed Caitiffs, under Death, Wrath and Condemnation, and that before God, or in his sight. Nay, Sir, he doth say, that it is because of our Faith, and for our Faith, and that Faith is the merit by which we have it; which though I doubt not but may pass with a favourable construction, yet are higher Titles of Honour than any of our Divines do give unto her in pleading for Conditions in the Covenant.

52 *The Covenant of Grace not Absolute,*

Your next Author was *Peter Martyr*; his Commentary on the Epistle to the *Romans* I have, where I meet with that common place, cap. 11. p. 1281. *De Justificatione*, in it the passage you cite, viz. *We deny that the Testament of God concerning the Remission of Sins in Christ, hath a Condition annexed to it.*

But first, I conceive, that *Martyr* here denies only a Condition of Works, or a Legal Condition. Such Legal Conditions *Pighius* did plead for. And that these are the Conditions which *Martyr* doth deny, his own words in the very same Page do clearly express. For having in the Line next after the Passage you quote out of him, alledged that of the Apostle at large, *Gal. 5. 15, 16, 17.* he presently from this Testimony draws this Inference, as an Explication of his former Negation of Conditions in the Testaments, *Hec verba clarissime docent; These words do most clearly teach, that the Testament which God made with Abraham, was pure and absolute; & sine ulla legali conditione, and without any legal condition.* But that he should deny the Condition of Faith, or that Faith was required to Justification, that common place shews not, but rather the contrary; for about some Leaves after, speaking of that, *Rom. 4. It shall be imputed to us, as it was to Abraham, if we believe; he thus saith,*

Is it not here clearly enough said, that we must believe, that that Jesus Christ, whom God raised again, died and rose again, that we might be justified, and that all our sins might be forgiven us? p. 129. And a little after, Every one that seeth the Son and believeth on him, hath Eternal Life. Thus therefore we infer, But I believe on the Son of God, therefore I now have, and shall have that which he hath promised, p. 1293. Unless Faith be wanting, whereby we may apprehend the things offered, we are justified by the Promises, p. 1294. Martyr in that common place reasons wholly against Justification by Works. And the Condition there spoken of, unless we will do apparent injury to the Author, we must understand the Condition of Works, or of the Law, which both there, and in this eleventh Argument he excludes, both from the Covenant with Abraham, and the Work of Justification.

2. Let but *Martyr* expound himself, and then it will appear what Conditions he denies, and in what manner; nor shall I lead you any further for discovery of this, than this his Commentary on the Epistle to the *Romans*. Look then *Chap. 10.* on those words, *For righteousness to every one that believeth; and you shall find the dif-*

difference between the Law and the Gospel, thus set down by him.

The Law is received by doing, and most exact performing that which is commanded: But the Gospel by a lively and efficacious assent of Faith. Moses also Deut. 30. writeth concerning the Law, that he had set before the People Life and Death, manifestly teaching, that if the Law be received and fulfilled, it will bring Eternal Life with it: But seeing we are shut out from this Benefit, the merciful God hath provided another word, to wit, of Faith; which if by assenting to it, it be received, bringeth Life along with it. From this place it appeareth, that the Promises of the Law were given from the supposition or condition of Works going before. But in the Gospel, if Works are annexed to the Promises, they are not so to be understood, as either the Merit or Causes of those Promises. But we must thus conclude, That these Gifts of God which are promised, follow after the Works, tho' they be not perfect and absolute as they are commanded in the Law, p. 1026, 1027. This place, (I hope) will shew, that Peter Martyr was only against the condition of Works, and there too against their merit or efficacy; for as for their presence, he allows, that they are required in the Gospel. But as for the Condition of Faith, he is not at all against it. Turn to one place more, Rom. 8. If we suffer with him, &c. Where, setting down the differences between the Promises of the Law and of the Gospel, he saith, They do not differ in this, (as some think) that the Promises Evangelical have no Conditions annexed; but the Legal Promises are never offered without Conditions; for as it's said, Honour thy Father and thy Mother, that thou may'st live long upon the Earth. And if ye be willing and obedient ye shall eat the good of the Land. So we read also in the Gospel, Forgive, and it shall be forgiven; give, and it shall be given, &c. Wherefore seeing this is not the difference, we must seek out some other. It appeareth therefore to him that diligently considereth, that the Conditions of the Law might be causes of the obtainment of the Rewards promised: for if they had been perfect and absolute, as the Law required them, they might be compared with the Rewards themselves, and had also had esteem of merit; but seeing these cannot be performed by Men, God of his mercy gave in their stead Evangelical Promises, which although they have Conditions added, yet are offered freely, p. 667. Wherefore if thou joyn these three things together, that the Evangelical Rewards are promised freely, that the Conditions cannot be compared unto, or equalized with them, that the Promises must be most firm, and take away

54 *The Covenant of Grace not Absolute,*

away the account of merit, you may see wherein these differ from those of the Law, p. 668.

And thus I hope it is manifest, that they were Conditions of Works which *Peter Martyr* did deny; that he did not deny them simply neither, but only as meritorious and causal of the Benefits promised; that he held Faith to be the Requisite or the Condition of the Gospel. So that you must give me leave to take *Martyr* from you too, and put him down with the forenamed Authors, for a Patron of our Cause.

3. Next unto *Peter Martyr*, you cite *Olevian*, but whether with any more advantage to your Cause than the former, or disadvantage to us, is the business of our present enquiry.

If you please, with second thoughts, (which are most commonly the best) to look into him, you shall find, that when he denies Conditions in the Covenant, they are only such as, first, are performed by, and proceeding from our own strength; which we with him do acknowledge to be none, and therefore also deny the same. 2. Which arise from, or carry along with them a consideration of dignity, or worthiness in our selves. 3. Are of a meritorious nature. Such Conditions as these, we together with him disclaim. That these are the Conditions which he doth deny, is so clear and plain, that he which runs may read. If you begin with his definition of the Covenant of Grace, you shall find him in the close thereof expressing himself thus; *Without the condition or stipulation of any good thoughts from their own strength, De subst. scd. grat. p. 3.* Having spoken concerning God, who makes the Covenant, he comes afterward to consider the persons with whom this Covenant is made, and shews, that the very Elect themselves, to whom it doth especially belong, are by nature children of wrath, dead in sins, such whose hearts are hearts of stone, unable to think a good thought of themselves, meer darkness, enemies to God, slaves to sin and Satan. Now forasmuch as they are such, God (saith he) promiseth he will not make any such Covenant with them, which in the least part thereof should be founded on their own strength to perform it, p. 12. Wherefore lest the Covenant should fail and be of none effect, men being miserable, dead in sins, having hearts of stone, such as are not subject to the Law of God, neither indeed can be, Rom. 8. Who are not able of themselves to think any thought that is good: but that it may remain firm and everlasting, he promiseth such a Covenant, the whole essence whereof doth depend

on himself alone, and is founded in his Son Jesus Christ.— He promiseth also such a manner of executing in us this his decree and purpose, the strength and efficacy whereof doth not proceed from corrupt man, but from himself alone, p. 13. A little after, he sums up all that he had said concerning the nature and substance of the Covenant, thus, *Wherefore, if you look upon God, the efficient cause, and those to whom he promiseth the Covenant; or if you consider the matter and form thereof, you shall still find it is a Covenant of free Grace, and that it doth not depend on any condition of our worthiness, merits, or our proper strength*— The most merciful God did see the promise would be vain in respect of our own vanity, which should depend on the condition of our own strength, p. 14. What here he doth deliver so plainly, and in such express terms, you may (if you please to look into him) find him afterwards (p. 211, & 215.) repeating again and again.

Sir, By these passages you may see you have not gained any thing by *Oleuiam*, nor your Adversaries lost by what he speaks against Conditions in the Covenant.

Now that you may further see, that he speaks rather on their side whom you oppose, than for you; I shall intreat you to consider some other passages in him.

1. He tells us, that in this Covenant there is, and must be a mutual consent between God and us, yea, a consent testified by both parties: for immediately after his definition of the Covenant in the substance of it, (which we mentioned before) he comes to consider the administration of it, which he saith is dispersed by the Lord, by voice and visible signs, *In testimonium mutui consensus inter Deum & nos; In testimony of this mutual consent which is between God and us*, p. 3. The same he doth elsewhere more largely repeat, as I shall shew you by and by. How both parties do give their consent in making the Covenant, he doth afterwards declare, and withal the freeness of the Grace of God in both.

The whole substance of the Covenant (saith he) is free: In respect of God, he properly makes the Covenant with us, when he doth in our Hearts by the Holy Spirit seal the Promise of Free Reconciliation offered in the Gospel, and beginneth our renovation to eternal life, doth daily carry it on, and at last doth perfect it. In respect of us who were dead in sins and trespasses, the Covenant is received when the Holy Ghost is freely given to us, whereby being raised from death to life, it

comes

56 The Covenant of Grace not Absolute,

comes to pass that we not only have a will and power to believe the Promise of Free Grace concerning Reconciliation by Christ, and the renewing of us, that we may enter into the inheritance of the heavenly Kingdom, but also do believe or receive Faith it self. So that the freeness and absoluteness of the Covenant doth not consist in this, that there is no condition or duty required on our parts, but none that is to be performed by our own strength; as he some few lines after doth express himself.

Thus (saith he) it is certain, that this whole Covenant is meerly of free Grace, and doth not depend on any condition of our own strength, but on the free Mercy of God in Christ, apprehended by Faith, which himself doth bestow; The offer or tender of a double Promise in Christ, to wit, of the remission of sins, and sanctification, and so the donation of Christ himself, is, in respect of God, most free. The acceptance on our part is also free, because it is the action of God in us, whereby he doth seal the Promise to our hearts; so that being acted by him, we do act; being by him made Believers, we do believe; and being quickened or created by Christ unto good works, we do walk in them. p. 16.

Thus far Olevian in that place: And who is there, Sir, of these whom you oppose, that doth not say the same with him? So that your quoting of him is at least to little purpose for your opinion: I might farther shew you, that he in another place, (p. 211, 212, 213, 216.) repeating the same thing, adds, once and again, that God in giving Faith to his Elect and chosen ones, doth thereby give with it to them also universam substantiam foederis, the whole substance of the Covenant. So that the Remission of Sin promised in the Covenant, is not Antecedent, but Consequent to Faith; which in effect is as much for the conditionality of Faith, in reference to the Pardon of Sin, and the Salvation of Souls, as is contended for by those whom you oppose; but I will not insist on that. I shall, for your and the Readers better information and satisfaction touching the judgment of this learned Divine in this point, entreat you to observe,

2. That as he doth plead for a mutual consent of both Parties in the Covenant; so he doth withal maintain, that when God for his part performs the federatory action (as his phrase is) *prius assensum a nobis stipulatur*: he doth first require our assent to the Promises and Duties or Conditions of the Covenant. Thus he expresseth himself more than once, shewing withal, that this Position is most agreeable to the Scripture of the Old and New Testa-

Testament ; alledging to this purpose, that voluntary and federal Contract between God and the People expressed by *Moses*, *Thou hast avouched the Lord this day to be thy God, and to walk in his Ways, and to keep his Statutes, and his Commandments, and his Judgments, and to hearken unto his Voice. And the Lord hath this day avouched thee to be his peculiar People, as he hath promised thee, Deut. 26. 17, 18.* Setting down at large several Reasons why the Lord is pleased thus to proceed in the administration of his Covenant, and that in reference to both the Elect and Reprobate ; those which are sincere, and those which are but hypocritical professors of, and parties in the Covenant.

So that if you lay all the passages of *Olevian* together, you may (at leastwise the indifferent Reader may) see that you have gained nothing by him, nor have your Adversaries lost him.

4. Having dispatch'd *Olevian*, in the next place I turn to *Zanchy*, whom you alledge as being fully for you. And I confess, at the first sight, looking on him with a bare superficial glance, he doth seem wholly to be yours, especially if you pitch on one passage, and do not compare it with others in the same place. 'Tis true, he doth affirm, (*In Hof. 2. anal. in v. 21, 22. § 1.*) that God saith, *Most absolutely without any condition of Faith and Repentance inserted, I will betroth thee to me for ever.* But if you please seriously to weigh what he delivereth in his Commentary on the same Chapter, and compare one thing with another, you shall find, That

1. The Absoluteness which he speaks of lyeth in this, not that Faith and Repentance are not required on the Church's part to make up the match, but that the making or dissolving of the Matrimonial federal Contract between the Lord and the Church, shall not depend on any condition to be performed by the Church of her own power and strength, for the Lord doth undertake even for the Church, to work in her Faith, Repentance and all other Graces requisite to the making and perpetuating of the match, that it be not broken ; so he speaks, and doth declare himself in the end of that very Paragraph, the beginning whereof you take hold of as serving your turn.

God promiseth both a new Marriage, and also all things which even on the Wives part are necessary for the making and confirming of the Match. And more fully afterwards, He promiseth, That he will cause that we shall be joyned to him in a perpetual marriage. But the

marriage cannot be perpetual, unless as in God, so also thire be in us Faith and the Spirit of Christ continuing to the end, by which this marriage is both contracted and preserved. Therefore he doth promise, that Faith and the Spirit of Christ shall continue in us, Ibid. § 25. You may there (§ 26, 27, ad 33.) at large see him assert, That there are *connubii leges*, as he calls them, *Laws of the Marriage*, or Conditions thereof, which are to be observed by the Church for her part, which God doth undertake to write in her heart, that so the marriage may be made and continued. And what doth Zanchy, I pray you, here say more, than any of those whom you oppose? or who is there of those against whom you alledge him, that doth not assert the very same? If you look back into his Commentary on the same Chapter and Verse, you shall find him speaking the same thing, and explicating himself, in what sense he saith 'tis a Promise without a Condition. *It is to be noted*, (saith he, explicating those words, *I will betroth thee to me*) *that this is a simple and Evangelical Promise, without any Condition; for here God doth exact nothing; (to wit, to be done by their own strength) but doth simply promise what he himself will do to his Church; so that he doth promise Faith it self, without which the rest of the Promises can have no place in us.*

2. You may observe, That when he saith, The Promise is made without any Condition, his meaning is, without any Condition in us *Antecedaneous*, as a moving cause, inducing or inclining the Lord to enter into this Covenant, and to make this Matrimonial Contract: all the cause thereof the Lord finds in, of, and from himself; in which regard he prevents us, not we him. Thus he doth afterwards clearly express himself: *By that word, I will betroth thee; he doth give us to understand, that God is the Author of our Reconciliation, and consequently of our Salvation. He it is that doth first come to us and betroth us to himself. We do not prevent him, or seek him to be our Husband; but he preventeth us, that he may betroth us unto himself, 1 John 4. Not that we loved him first, but he loved us first. Wo be to us, if God did not prevent us,* § 5.

Thus Zanchy; and what have you gained by him in this particular, or your opposites lost? Do they not speak the same things? and when they assert Conditions, yet deny them to be on our part antecedaneous, or any moving causes, acknowledging that all doth proceed from the meer good pleasure of God, according to

to the purpose which he purposed in himself, and that *he loveth his People with whom he makes the Covenant, because he loveth them, as Moses sometime said to Israel, Deut. 7.*

3. That in denying of Conditions, he doth deny Conditions that are meritorious, and that the Covenant it self, as also the Promises are free without respect unto, or dependance on any thing that is of merit in us. Thus, in the very next Page, setting down the substantial or essential Heads of the Covenant, he delivereth his mind; *The manner of making the Covenant, or of Promising, is, that God of his free grace, without any merits of ours, doth make this Covenant with us, and it doth not depend on any merits of our own at all, Pag. 44. § 3* And do not those whom you oppose, and think to strengthen your opposition against them by Zanchy's Authority, produced and urged for you; do not (I say) they speak the same thing with him in this particular? Hitherto I shewed, that Zanchy is not so much for you, as you would make the World believe he is; I shall now make it appear, that in the same place, however he doth not use the word *Condition*, (which yet he doth in other places) yet he speaks the same thing for substance which they do against whom you alledge him. And that there are such Conditions required on the Churches part as we plead for, consider with me to this purpose:

1. His Explication of that Phrase, *I will betroth thee to me. When God doth make a new Covenant with any People, he is said to betroth them to himself, because that by the Bond of the Covenant he will unite himself to that People, and they are likewise joyned to God, as the Bridegroom is to the Bride, and the Bride to the Bridegroom; Faith of the Marriage being given on both sides, or by both parties, P. 43. And*

2. His definition of the Covenant, which he doth afterwards largely insist on, setting down the chief and essential Heads thereof, (*Ibid. 43. Col. 2.*) *The Covenant of God with Man, (saith he) is mutua pactio, a mutual agreement between both parties; where-in God of his meer grace, and for Christ's sake, doth promise two things: 1. That he will be a God to us, or receive us into his favour, pardoning all our sins for Christ's sake, and impute his righteousness unto us. 2. That he will bestow the Kingdom of Heaven on us for our inheritance. And doth also require of man two things: 1. Faith, 2. Obedience, that he order his life according to the pleasure of God: and both parties do by outward signs confirm Fidem sibi invicem da-*

tam. You may find the same thing delivered by him in the first and second Heads of the Covenant. And in the next Page. *The substance of the Covenant on God's part, (saith he) is that which God of his free grace doth offer and promise us; on our part, that which he doth require of us, and which we promise to perform, That we do embrace this reconciliation offered and promised, That we will be his People, &c. P. 45.*

Now, Sir, if you will be pleased to consider these several Assertions of Zanchy, in this very place which you your self did quote, 1. Faith is that Grace which is on the Church's part necessary to make up the Marriage-Covenant between the Lord and her. 2. This Grace the Lord doth promise absolutely to give, it being that Grace without which the rest of the Promises have no place in us. 3. It is also our Duty; God doth in the Covenant command it, we promise to perform it. 4. It is that wherein, on our part, the substance of the Covenant doth consist. Lay them altogether, and you may clearly see here is an acknowledgment of the thing, Faith is the Condition of the Covenant, though he doth not give it the name. But to give you a further taste of him, that it may be out of all question that he doth assert Conditions, both name and thing; I shall only intreat you to peruse one place more in him, (*In 1. Epist. Joha. cap. 1. loc. de rem. peccat. q. 6.*) where he doth largely handle that great Blessing and Benefit of the Covenant, the Remission of Sins. In the sixth place he comes to consider, *On what condition it is offered and conferred*; and mentions three: 1. The first and chief, is the true and constant practice of Repentance. 2. Confession and Acknowledgment of our Offences to those whom we have injured and wronged. 3. A brotherly forgiving of those which have sinned against and offended us. Where he doth withal maintain, *That they are Conditions not for which, but without which the Remission of Sins is not obtained*; denying them to be Conditions meritorious. Therefore St. John saith, *If we confess; Behold the condition*; yet he doth not say, for our confession, he will forgive. Justification cannot be had without Faith; but we do not say, it is obtained for the worth of our Faith; but freely, or of free Grace. Moreover, this is (saith he) to be noted, that even the very Conditions which God requireth of us, are given to us by God: Therefore the Remission of Sins is not to be ascribed in any sort to our Merits, but to the Grace of God alone. You have here Zanchy, speaking as fully and

as plainly for Conditions, as any of those whose Doctrin you oppose, in which regard I must intreat you either to quit your claim to this Author, and leave him to stand on our side against you; or else to change your mind and judgment, come over to us, and then *Zanchy* is yours when you are ours.

5. The Testimony of learned *Junius* is next produced by you, as that which seems to be most for you of all the Authors; and yet not so much as is pretended. The Oration of his, which you mention, I have not. In his Parallels he doth indeed make mention of it, (*Paral. l. 3. c. 9.*) as that wherein he had proved, that the Hebrew word, ברית, oft-times in the Scriptures of the Old Testament; and the Latine word *Fœdus*, both according to the Etymology and Use thereof in classical Authors, are not restrained to those federal Promises wherein there is a mutual stipulation between divers Parties expressed, but for such declarations and dispositions as proceed from one alone; so that the Hebrew word might well be rendred by the Apostle, *διαθήκη*. Now this is a thing which is not denied, but acknowledged and granted by those, which yet nevertheless do assert a mutual stipulation, and conditions (in that regard) in the Covenant of Grace. So that if this be the scope and drift of that Oration, as it seems to be by his mentioning of it for this end and purpose; it is alledged by you to little purpose, seeing it doth neither make for you, nor against us. In prosecution of this, which is the main drift of that Parallel, and, as I conceive by his own citing of it, of the Oration also, he adds, *That the grace of God is manifested much more clear to men, in that he doth not give a Covenant, but a Testament to those that are his: For the Covenant would have Conditions, which if either part do not perform, the Covenant is made void. But a Testament is an instrument of Liberality and Grace, without any Condition; by which men are called and appointed Heirs, without respect to any Duty which might proceed from them.* By this passage of *Junius* you may take notice, who that *Vir maximus* is whom Dr. Ames cites, in that place of his *Coronis*, which is quoted by you. Now as for this place of *Junius*, we must either expound it of meritorious Conditions, (which those words, *without respect to any Duty*, seem to intimate) or of Conditions legal, to be performed by our own strength, such as were in the Covenant of Works: for Conditions Evangelical and not Meritorious, he doth in expresse terms aver in the

62 *The Covenant of Grace not Absolute,*

new Covenant or Testament. *The substance* (saith he) *of either Testament, is one and the same, common in Jesus Christ; and that consists of two parts, as it was first manifested to Abraham, Gen. 17. and afterwards to his Posterity; the one containing the Promise, when God saith, I will be their God; the other the Condition added, wherein God requircth, that we should in like manner obey him, when he saith, And they shall be my People.* And if you please to peruse the Chapter, (*Par. lib. 3. c. 8.*) out of which the next Quotation is cited at large, or the passage it self that is alledged, you shall find him acknowledging, (*Par. l. 2. part. 16.*) that the Covenant of the Gospel hath its Conditions annexed, as well as the Covenant of Works; and withal, such a Condition, as to Man in himself, is impossible, though in regard of the Lord's gracious Promise, who doth undertake to work in his own Federates the very Condition it self, 'tis to them, through power of his Grace and efficacy of his Spirit, made profitable and easie; where, when he had fitly shewed the Agreement between *Moses*, setting down the Tenor and Condition of the Covenant which God did make with *Israel*, (besides the Covenant which he made with them at *Horeb*) and *St. Paul*, expressing the Tenor of the Gospel, which is a Declaration of the same Covenant of Grace which *Moses* mentioneth, he doth thus paraphrase those words of the Covenant, which both do expresse, *The Word is nigh thee, in thy Mouth, and in thine Heart; i. e. This Commandment of Faith which I declare is neither hidden, nor far off from thee, seeing God doth graciously put it into thy Mouth, and into thy Heart, if thou by Faith wilt lay hold of it.*

Thus you have *Junius* against *Junius*, or rather *Junius* expounding himself, telling you in plain terms, that he holds Conditions in the New Covenant, which God of his free Grace gives his Creature to perform. So that the former place, where he excludes Conditions from the Covenant, must (as I said before) be understood of legal and meritorious Conditions, which sort of Conditions we shut out of the Covenant as well as he.

6. Leave we *Junius*, as much, if not more, on our side than on yours, and come we to the next, *Dr. Ames*, (for as for *Estius* and *Lessius*, though I value one, the former of them, yet I shall not look after them at present, not for that I doubt they are against me, but for that I care not much to have them

them for me, being by you upbraided already with joyning with Papists, though it seems you can your self accept of the Patronage of Papists when you can get it.) Come we, I say, to Dr. Ames: and I could willingly chide you for open foul play, in citing an Author expressly against his own words, in the very place you cite out of him. Immediately before your very citation, Ames hath these words:

We grant, that Man's Duty is required, maintaining this withal, that God, by vertue of this Promise, will cause those that are his, that they shall perform the Duty, as far forth as it is necessary to be done, Cor. act. 5. p. 400. And immediately after your Quotation (which is verbatim the same with that Junius delivereth in his Parallel, where he mentions his Oration that you alledge) he doth thus express himself: The whole disposition is after the manner of a Will and Testament, as it is considered simply, either in whole, or according to the parts of it; but if the benefits that are bequeathed, be compared within themselves, then one is to the other as it were a condition. And in this respect it is sometimes propounded after the manner of a Covenant: which manner of propounding is not so to be taken, as that it should in any part change the nature of a Testament. Our Divines are wont excellently to joyn both together, when they teach, that Righteousness and Life are promised upon condition of Faith, and that Faith it self is given to the Elect, or that the condition of the Covenant is also promised in the Covenant. How plainly on both these places doth Dr. Ames express himself for that conditionality in the Covenant which we maintain; and that in the same place whence you fetch your proof against us? Was it for this, my good Friend, that you took the pains to write so much out of the Doctor? and that you shewed me your written Copy, and not the Book, when I was with you, lest if you had brought the Book, the place it self should have spoken and answered for it self? Whether this were the cause or no, I leave it to your Conscience; but assuredly your carriage in this and that other passage about Chamier, whom you would not take notice of to hold conditions proper (though it followed immediately your Allegation out of him) until I read it to you, and then would not look upon it, nor hardly hear it, but put it off, with saying, that he did eat his own words. I say, these carriages make me and mine, and your dear Friend who was with me, fear that your Opinion sticks more in

64 *The Covenant of Grace not Absolute,*

in your Will then in your Mind. Your Eyes and Ears are open and ready to entertain any Author, though a Popish one, that makes for your Opinion; but if he be against your Tenent, though he be never so godly, hardly have you patience to look upon him. Well, (Sir) what hath now been, as also what was formerly alledged out of Dr. Ames, do abundantly prove him to have been for that conditionality of the Covenant we defend.

7. Pass we on to Doctor Preston, where again you may be blamed; for when the Doctor laid down a Distinction between the Covenants, or rather between the Promises of the same Covenant; viz. the Promise of Grace, which he calleth an Absolute Covenant made with the Elect, Jer. 31. Ezek. 36. and the Promise of Life, which he calls a Conditional Covenant made with all, *If thou believe, thou shalt be saved*, Mark 16. You run away with a piece, and put down Dr. Preston for a defender of the Absoluteness of the Covenant, though both there, and in his Treatise of the Covenant (of which I believe you were not ignorant) he writes many Leaves to the contrary. But I hope you will wipe this Author also out of your List, after I have rehearsed some passages unto you out of him. Look then either in that, or the Sermon foregoing, (for I have not the Book now by me) and you shall find Dr. Preston asserting Faith to be required, and that precedently to our being in Covenant: For thus he writes, *That which is required of them is only, that they take it. And there is nothing precedently required or looked for on our parts, but taking and applying of it.* So, Page 18. *The taking of Christ, makes Christ ours.* — Faith is that whereby the right of Christ is made ours unto salvation. Page 62, 63. he tells us of the reconciling and justifying Act of Faith; which, he saith, is direct, and is that whereby we take Christ; as well as of its pacifying Act, which he calls reflex, and saith it is that whereby we know we take him: yea, he tells us, that *Humiliation is required*, not as a qualification: but as our sense of sickness is required to our seeking of cure, so this to our seeking of Christ, without which we will never come to Christ. And would you know what *this taking of Christ is*, which he saith is precedently required? He tells you, toward the latter end of the first Sermon, that it is to know Christ rightly, as Prophet, Priest and King — *To obey him.* — *To forsake all other*
for

for him. — To pitch on him with our whole deliberate and sincere will. Moreover, after this our receipt of him, We are (saith he) required to obey him, to be holy as he is holy, to forsake all; which he calls *After-clap Conditions*, and *Hard Conditions*. And Page 25. Those that be humble, and see God's Wrath what it is, that have their Consciences awakened to see Sin, will come in and be glad to have Christ, though on these conditions: but the other will not. If you will have Christ on these conditions, you may. But we Preach in vain; all the World refuseth Christ, because they will not leave their Covetousness, Pride, &c. And all because they be not humbled. Now whereas he excludes Conditions in some passages, he tells you in what sense he excludes them: Page 15. When we exclude all Conditions, we exclude such a frame and habit of Mind, which we think is necessarily required to make us worthy to take him. By which it appears clearly, they were meritorious Conditions he excluded.

To these I may add, how in his Treatise of the New Covenant, Page 217. he gives this for his fourth Reason, why uprightness is required; viz. That there might be an Integrity on both sides; A Covenant, as on God's part, so on ours: That as he promiseth he will be all sufficient, so he requireth this again on our parts, That we be altogether his. And Page 357. That the Condition God required of Abraham was, that he should believe; where he spends many Leaves in shewing that, and why Faith is the Condition of the New Covenant, Page 389. That Repentance, the Condition required of us, is part of the Covenant, both on God's part and on ours. The Condition that is required of us, as part of the Covenant, is the doing of this, the action. But the ability whereby we are able to perform these, is a part of the Covenant on the Lord's part. Page 398. That when we do believe, 'at that very Hour we enter into Covenant, and are translated from Death to Life: And Page 458. When the Heart gives her full consent, and takes the Lord for her God and Governour, then is the Contract made up between them.

These passages (Sir) abundantly satisfy me concerning that holy and reverend Author, that he held Faith to be the grand Condition of the Gospel, precedently required to; not only our knowing our selves in a state of Grace, but our very being therein, and right thereto. If he say, that the Covenant, that is, one part of it, viz. the Promise of Grace, is absolute; he

66 *The Covenant of Grace not Absolute,*

saith no more than others; for I know none of our side that hold that part to be antecedently conditional. Some call it a *Free*, others an *Absolute Promise*, others a *Covenant with Christ for us*, &c. Yea, in regard of the freeness and absoluteness of it, they grant the Covenant in respect of the Elect to be equivalent to an absolute Promise, and the Purchase equivalent to an absolute Purchase, (as you may see *Owen Univ. Redemp. lib. 3. cap. 2.*) the Conditions on which Salvation is promised, being purchased and promised as well as the Salvation. Notable are the Expressions of Mr. *Rutherford* in this particular, (*Survey of Antinom. p. 129.*) *We teach Faith a Condition on our part, and also a Grace promised: Christ brings himself, his righteousness, and the condition of Faith too, which doth receive him. As if some Prince should freely promise to marry some Maid of low estate, on condition she wear a Gold Chain, with a rich Jewel of the Crown in it, and withal should bind himself to give her both the Chain and a Will to wear it.* Again, *He is both without doors knocking, and within doors opening, yet he never cometh in, but upon condition we open, which condition is also his own work. He offers Righteousness so the sinner believe, and he works belief that the sinner may have Righteousness,* pag. 109.

Thus you see others, as well as Dr. *Preston*, assert the absoluteness of the Covenant in that part; who yet still maintain the other part, viz. the Promise of Life and Salvation to be conditional; which, as hath been already shewed, Dr. *Preston* doth maintain.

8. As for Mr. *Walker*, (*Socin. Disc. & Confut. pag. 225.*) he denies not all kinds of Conditions in the place cited, but only *Conditions Legal*, and Conditions for which; meritorious ones: but Conditions which are as a means by which the free gift is received, and as a qualification whereby one is made capable and fit to receive and enjoy the free gift; such he granteth, and calleth them *Conditions* in the place cited by you; saying, *There is no condition of the Covenant propounded, but only the way and means to receive the blessing, or the quality and condition by which men are made capable and fit to enjoy the blessing: which is as much as I plead for under that Title.*

As for Mr. *Strong*, though both what I have heard from him my self, and also what I have heard from others who have seen his Sermon, induce me to believe, that he is not against our Conditions,

ditions, yet having not his Sermon, I must be altogether silent at this time concerning him.

By this (Sir) you may see, that I have looked into the most of the Authors which you cited, and among them all I must profess unto you, that I find not one that speaketh fully for you, but more against, than for your Tenent: and for that sort of Conditions, whose cause I plead, I must intreat you therefore to shake hands with them, and leave them to stand on my side. To them I shall add some few more.

1. Mr. Perkins shall be the first, who puts down Conditions in the very description of the Covenant, saying, (*Order of the Causes of Salvation*, c. 31.) *The Covenant of Grace is that, whereby God freely promising Christ and his Benefits, exacteth again of Man, that he would receive Christ by Faith, and repent of his Sins. In the Covenant of Grace two things (saith he elsewhere, Ref. Cath. tit. of Justif. Diff. 2. 2.) must be considered, the Substance thereof, and the Condition. The Substance of the Covenant is, that Righteousness and Life Everlasting is given to God's Church and People by Christ. The Condition is, that we for our parts are by Faith to receive the foresaid Benefits, and this Condition is by Grace as well as the Substance.*

2. Mr. Reynolds shall be next; in his *Treatise of the Life of Christ*, p. 399 he calls Faith the conveyance: and p. 403. *We expect Justification by Faith in Christ.*— *Faith unites us to Christ, and makes his Death, Merit, Life, Kingdom, Sonship, Victory, Benefits to become ours. You may see p. 451, 452, 453. That to Marriage between Christ and his Church, whereby the Church hath a right and propriety created, to the Body, Name, Goods, Table, Possession, and Purchases of Christ,--- is essentially required consent, which consent must be mutual; for though Christ declare his good will when he knocketh at our doors, yet if we keep at distance, stop our ears at his invitations, there is then no Covenant made. It is but a Wooing, and no Marriage, &c. Pag. 465, 466, 467. That the Office of Faith is to unite to Christ, and give possession of him, till which union by Faith be made, we remain poor and miserable, notwithstanding the fulness that is in Christ. Pag. 478, 479. and to name no more, pag. 512. setting down the difference between the two Covenants, he saith, They differ in the Conditions, for in the old Covenant, Legal Obedience; but in the new, Faith only is required, and the certain consequent thereof, Repentance.*

68 *The Covenant of Grace not Absolute,*

3. Mr. Ball shall be the third, who saith, (*Treat. of the N. Cov. p. 17.*) *The Covenant of Grace doth not exclude all conditions, but such as will not stand with grace; and pag. 18. The stipulation required, is, that we take God to be our God; that is, that we repent of our Sins, believe the Promises of Mercy, and embrace them with the whole Heart, and yield Love, Fear, Reverence, Worship, and Obedience, to him, according to the prescript Rule of his Word: And p. 20. If then we speak of Conditions, by Conditions, we understand whatsoever is required on our part, as precedent, concomitant, or subsequent to Justification. Repentance, Faith, and Obedience, are all conditions. But if by conditions, we understand what is required on our part, as the cause of that God promised, though only instrumental, Faith or Belief in the Promises of free Mercy is the only condition.*

4. Let learned Pemble be the fourth; who, speaking of the difference between the Law and the Gospel, saith, (*Treat. of Justif. §. 4. c. 1.*) *The diversity is this, The Law offers Life unto Man upon condition of perfect Obedience, cursing the Transgressors thereof in the least kind with Eternal Death. The Gospel offers Life unto Man upon another condition, viz. Repentance and Faith in Christ, promising Remission of Sin to such as repent and believe. That this is the main essential difference between the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace, we shall endeavour to make good against the Romish Apostacy. And about a Leaf after, Hence we conclude firmly, that the difference between the Law and the Gospel, assigned by our Divines, is most certain and agreeable to the Scriptures, viz. That the Law gives life unto the Just upon condition of perfect obedience in all things: The Gospel gives life unto sinners, upon condition they repent and believe in Christ Jesus. Where you may take notice, that he lays it down not as his own private Opinion, but as the general Tenent of all the Orthodox Divines in his time, and that in opposition to our Popish Adversaries. It was then no Popery to hold Conditions in the Covenant: and as he of the Divines of his time, so may I of the Divines of this present Age. See their consent and harmony herein, *Larg. cat. p. 9**

5. Dr. Downam shall be the fifth; (*Treat. 1. of Justif. l. 6. c. 8. §. 10.*) *That which is the only condition of the Covenant of Grace, by that alone we are justified. But Faith is the only condition of the Covenant of Grace, which is therefore called, Lex fidei. And l. 7. c. 2. §. 6. Our Writers, distinguishing the two Covenants of God, that is, the Law and the Gospel, whereof the one is the Covenant of Works, the*
other

other is the Covenant of Grace, do teach, that the Law of Works is that which to Justification requireth Works as the condition thereof. The Law of Faith, that which to Justification requireth Faith as the condition thereof. The former saith, Do this and thou shalt live; the latter, Believe in Christ and thou shalt be saved.

6. Dr. Davenant doth also fully express himself several times to the like purpose, and may in the sixth place be added to the former. His words are these:

In the Covenant of the Gospel it is otherwise; for in this Covenant, to the obtainment of Reconciliation, Justification, and Life eternal, there is no other condition required than of true and lively Faith; God so loved the World, John 3. 16. Therefore Justification, and the right to Eternal Life doth depend on the conditions of Faith alone, De just. act. c. 30. in resp. ad ob. 3. Where he doth afterwards thus briefly shew the difference between the Law and the Gospel, considered as two distinct Covenants; The Law (saith he) hath the very strength and form of a Covenant made in the condition of Works. But the Gospel placeth the very strength and form of a Covenant, made in the Blood of the Mediator apprehended by Faith, Ibid. What can be said more expressly than this? I will not trouble you with repeating what hath been already delivered out of him in his next Chapter, but only mention one passage or two out of him: The Promise of Eternal Life, according to the Covenant of the Gospel, and of Grace, doth depend on the condition of Faith, Id. cap. 32. in sol. ad ob. 1. p. 407. A little before, explicating in what sense we deny good Works to be required as conditions of Salvation, he thus speaks, If by conditions of Salvation, we understand the conditions of the Covenant, whereby we are received into the favour of God, and to the right of Eternal Life: for these depend on the only condition of Faith apprehending Christ the Mediator.

7. With the fore-mentioned Divines doth the learned Cameron (*de trip. fœd. Thes. 8, 9.*) fully agree, who handling the Agreement and Differences of the Covenant of Nature and of Grace, observes they both agree in the extrinsecal form, that to each there is annexed a stipulation, though in the thing it self required in each, by way of stipulation, they differ; for that in the Covenant of Nature, natural Righteousness is required; but in the Covenant of Grace, Faith alone is required. Whereupon, in the conclusion of his whole Discourse concerning that Subject, he gives this definition of the Covenant of Grace; It is that wherein God on the condition of Faith

70 The Covenant of Grace not Absolute,

in Christ proposed, doth promise the Remission of Sins in his Blood, and Life everlasting in Heaven, and that for this end, that he might shew the Riches of his Mercy, Theſ. 82

8. Unto these I may add *Parau*, who observes that the Apostle doth make mention of Faith, that (*In 3. ad Rom. 23. in illa verba, Per fidem.*) he may teach us, *fidem esse conditionem*, that Faith is the condition under which Christ is given unto us, as the propitiation for sins, and that it is the instrumental cause by which alone we obtain the propitiation in Christ. And elsewhere, setting down the difference between the Righteousness of the Law, and of Faith, or of the Gospel, he saith, *By that no man doth obtain Life, because the condition of doing all things required by the Law is not possible to any besides Christ. It is easie to obtain the fruit, and reap life by this, because the condition of confessing the Lord Jesus, and believing his Resurrection, is nigh in the mouth, and in the heart, In cap. 10. ad Rom. v. 9.*

9. The learned *Chamier*, that great assertor of the Truth of God against the Romish corrupters of it, is the next. He disputing with *Bellarmino* concerning the difference between the Law, and the Gospel, speaks as fully and plainly as any of the rest forenamed Protestant Divines, *That the Law of Works doth propose Salvation upon condition of fulfilling the Law. But the Law of Faith doth propose it upon condition only of believing in Christ; the word condition being taken in the same sense in both sides, Tom. 3. lib. 15. cap. 3. §. 26.* And having distinguished Conditions that are in Contracts and Covenants, that some are precedent, others are consequent; the former being such as are essential to the Contract or Covenant; yea, constituting the very essence and foundation of it. The other being such, the defect or want whereof doth make the Contract or Covenant to be void and of none effect, though they do not make the Covenant and Contract it self. He doth apply it to his present Subject, (§. 27, 28, 29.) *The Law of Works requireth the fulfilling of the Law as a condition antecedent, without which any man hath not, either the actual possession of, nor so much as a right to eternal life. The Law of Faith doth not admit Works as such a condition antecedent, but only consequent, so that they are necessary, ex vi donatæ jam propter fidem vitæ, by vertue of that right to eternal life, which is already conferred on them through Faith. Where you see Chamier doth clearly assert Faith to be the condition by which we do receive the right to life, given us by Grace;*

Grace; Works the condition consequent in the Covenant of Grace.

10. Mr. Bayn on the *Ephesians*. Remission of Sin is communicated from Christ in manner following: 1. Christ sendeth his Ministers, as Legats, with the Word of Reconciliation or Pardon, inviting them to believe on him, that they may receive forgiveness of sins. 2. He doth work together by his Spirit, making those who are his Children, believe on him, if they may find forgiveness in him. 3. He doth communicate to them the forgiveness which himself had procured and obtained for them. And on that fourth Verse, God doth not bind any directly and immediately to believe Salvation, but in a certain order, for he binds them first to believe on Christ to Salvation, and then brings them in Christ to believe, that he loved them, and gave himself for them.

11. Mr. Burroughs upon *Hosea*, upon those words, *I will betroth them unto me*; how frequently hath he those words, *It must be mutual, it must be mutual*, in every particular branch of it. He shews it must be mutual on the Church's part, as well as on God's part; and how can it be so without stipulation. In *Moses his self-denial*, p. 188. Faith hath the greatest honour above all other Graces to be the condition of the Covenant.

12. Last of all, It is the general Tenent of our Brethren in New England, as appears by Mr. Bulkly of the *Covenant*, p. 280, 281. where he handles that very Question. And also by the *Catalogue of Errors* that did arise there, and were condemned by an Assembly at the Church of New Town, August 31. 1637. attested by Mr. Welds, Err. 27. *It is incompatible to the Covenant of Grace to joyn Faith thereunto*, Err. 28. *To affirm there must be Faith on man's part to receive the Covenant, is to undermine Christ*, Err. 37. *We are compleatly united to Christ, before, or without any Faith wrought in us by the Spirit*, Err. 38. *There can be no true closing with Christ in a Promise that hath a Qualification or a Condition expressed*, Err. 82. Where Faith is held forth by the Ministers as the Condition of the Covenant of Grace on Man's part, as Justification by Sanctification, and the acting of Faith, in that Church there, is not sufficiency of Bread. By condemning these Opinions for Errors, they declare their Judgments to be for Conditions in the Covenant.

You see (Sir) with what a Cloud of Witnesses we are compassed, and how the stream of Protestant and true Religion hath run in this channel: certainly, it should be some more than ordinary cause, that should make us run counter to so many grave, learned, and godly Authors. Well, let us see what moves you to dissent. First, Many of them confess it to be Conditions improperly. Secondly, Many are driven to eat their own words. Now if both these were true, would they be of moment to make you dissent from your godly Brethren? Is Propriety of Speech such a Jewel, that for the preservation of it the good Names of the godly and orthodox Divines, and the Peace of the Church must be laid to stake? But who (my good Friend) shall be Judge of this Propriety? Certainly, if it shall continue for Language that was in the Doctor's time, you will be cast; for I am sure Conditions in the Covenant hath been, and is the Language most in use among the Orthodox.

I remember, when I had some conference with you in your Committee-house about your Sermon, you told me *Pemble* was for you, and *Chamier* for you, and all Polemick Writers were for you: and now the contrary proves true, and they are brought against you, now they speak improperly, and are sometimes forc'd to eat their words. I am sure you spake not properly when you told me, that they balked the word Condition.

But proceed we to the other Grounds. You go on and tell us, that another thing that causeth your distance was, the vigilancy of the Adversary, who was ready to make use of such Expressions for defence of their Tenents. This I confess is of more weight than the former, for we should be careful that we minister not the least advantage to the Adversary. Bishop *Davenant*, as hath been heard already, would not have us in conference with Papists, use such Speeches as these, That Works are necessary, and the like, because they will be apt to understand merit by them: yet nevertheless, that reverend Author doth use the word Condition, and very frequently: it seems he thought there was no such peril in the use of it. Again, The Adversaries you speak of, must be either Papists, or Arminians. Now as for Papists, you have delivered us from all fear that way, by telling us they stand not for any merit in the preparations they plead for; now if they took any advantage from the word Condition, it would be to approve of merit.

As

As for Arminians, they may take as much advantage from all Commands, Calls, and Counsels to Faith and Repentance to prove their Free Will, as from Conditions: So then these also must be laid aside. Besides, if there were danger in the Expression, can it not be qualified, so as that neither Papists nor Arminians may take any ground therefrom for the spreading of their Errors? must it needs be wholly cast away? Moreover, is there not as great a care to be had of Antinomians and Libertines, with whom our English Church begins to be pester'd? and may not these Spiders increase their Venom on your own gay Flowers of Absolute Freeness, to the poisoning of the Power of Godliness, both in their own and other Mens Conversations? May they not say, seeing no Conditions are required, Nothing on our part is to be done, I may live as I list, for I cannot break the Covenant?

Sir, This is an Inference not only may be made, but hath been made by too many in these loose times. I have heard sad Stories of it whil'st I lived in *London*; I have known the persons there that have cast off Sabbaths, Duties, Ordinances, with this Inference: and scoft at the followers of them; calling them, *Duty-mongers*, *Men of an Old Testament Spirit*, and the like.

You cannot be ignorant that such a horrid Inference is practically made from that Doctrin: And however you may think you have a Salve for it in your thoughts, (which how solid it may be I much question) yet how can you remedy it in the Hearts and Lives of others? Oh do not destroy by one Sermon more than you can build by ten.

But last of all, That that most moveth you, is your compassion to vulgar hearers, who hearing of Conditions, take not hold on the Promise, because they have not the Condition. Now here, in the Bowels of this Compassion, I do beseech you to consider what you do, and tell me seriously, Dare you bid a sinner, whil't he goes on impenitently in his evil way, never repenting of it, nor turning from it, nor looking after Christ; dare you (I say) offer such a Wretch the precious Blood of our blessed Saviour? And dare you bid such a one, continuing such, to lay hold on the Promise of Mercy? Dare you tell him, That the Gospel belongs unto him even while he is such? Dare you say, Here Drunkard, Swearer, Whore master, here is Salvation for thee, here is a Christ for thee, here is Life for thee, though thou go on in thy Swearing, Drinking, Whoring; Salvation is thine, take it, assure
L thy

thy self of it, it is thine? If you do, fare you well. I dare not, lest I strengthen the hands of the wicked; Old and New Testament are both against it. But if your meaning be, that such a sinner should alter his mind, leave his course, repent him of his evil way, give up himself wholly to Christ, and then, though never so foul, here was Water to cleanse him, and Blood to purge him, Mercy to pardon him, and a Christ to justify him. If your meaning (I say) be this, what do you but hold out Mercy conditional, even as we do, and to what end have you raised all this dust and stir?

To conclude, The Peace of the Church, and Edification of Souls should be most dear unto us; things we should both preach and pray, study and labour for, and by all means possible endeavour to procure, preserve, and propagate. Now I do beseech you (my dear Brother) seriously and sadly to consider, whether your present Tenent, and the broaching of it, doth not make a disturbance in the one, and a stop and hindrance in the other? My Heart akes to think of the late stirs in the *New England Churches*, occasioned by Master *Wheelwright*, Master *Hutchison*, and their followers, especially when I consider, that this very Tenent, *No Condition in the Covenant*, had a great influence thereon, if it were not the main cause thereof. For here began they to look upon all those faithful Ministers of Christ, who maintained Conditions, as no Preachers of Free Grace, no Gospel Ministers, Legal Teachers, not yet acquainted with the Gospel Covenant, nor able to give sufficient Bread to their People, as appears by the Examinations of Master *Hutchison*, and others in the Book fore-mentioned Thereupon they fell to a neglect of their Sermons, contempt of the Publick Ordinances, siding and faction, till in the end, for troubling of the Church her Peace, they were some of the chief of them cut off and banished. May not (my dear Brother) the like use be made of your present Doctrin? Yea, is it not (think you) already made by divers? Are not the Hearts of many taken off thereby from their faithful Ministers and Pastors, whom before they loved, prized, hearkened to, received good from, yea, haply received their conversion by, (if they be indeed converted?) are not (I say) their Hearts taken off from these their Spiritual Fathers, so that they neglect their Sermons, contemn their Counsels, call them, nick-name them Legal Teachers, and Ministers of the Old Testament? when yet I hope you your self can-

cannot in your conscience but acknowledge them for the true Ambassadors of the Lord Jesus. May not this ill issue of your Doctrin lye heavy on your Spirits? Again, May not the Writings of *Pemle, Preston, Perkins*, and other our Worthies, now with God, for their holding of Conditions, and professing the Conditions of Faith and Repentance, as without which we cannot have life, be laid aside and neglected? Nay, are not these Authors themselves contemned as Men of darker times, and not acquainted with such clear light as now shineth, though you know there is more of the power and marrow of Christianity in one of their Pages than in ten Leaves of your new lighted Meteors? Beside, are not many of the godly, who love you, and were hearers of you, driven from your Lectures, or at least cannot come to them without fear and jealousy? others thereby amazed, not knowing whom to follow? and most called away from the practice of Religion, to that needless disquisition of a curious Speculation? When the Builders clash, the Building must needs be interrupted; and when the Witnesses disagree, the Jurors can bring in little better than an *Ignoramus* in their Bill.

I do beseech you (Sir) to consider how by this your Tenent the Names and Doctrin of God's faithful Ministers, dead and living, are aspersed, the Minds of the Godly troubled, the Peace of the Church disquieted, the Hands of the Wicked strengthened, the Mouths of the Adversaries opened, and the Hearts of your Friends exceedingly sadden'd; and to draw back your foot before you are gone too far. By the Wicket of an Interpretative Absoluteness, I should hope that you might yet recover your self in safety; however, by the Door of Retraction I am sure you may: and though that Work be an unpleasing business to Flesh and Blood, yet is it one of the noblest Offices of a Christian Soldier, in which Spiritual Warfare, as well as in Temporal, as much Honour may be gained by a good Retreat, as by a courageous Encounter, or prosperous Victory.

F I N I S.

ADVERTISEMENT

O F

BOOKS Printed for *D. Newman*.

MR. *Samuel Rutherford's* Letters are all reprinted in one Volume, with a Table explaining the *Scotch* Words and Phrases, and rendring them into *English*.

Mr. *Robert Thrale's* Vindication of the Protestant Doctrin concerning Justification, and of its Preachers and Professors, from the unjust Charge of *Antinomism*.

The Marrow of Justification, or Justification without Works; wherein the Nature of Justification is opened, as it hath been formerly asserted by all sound Protestants, and the present prevailing Errors against the said Doctrin detected, by Mr. *Benj. Keetch*.

Austerchii, or the Art of Self-government, in a Moral Essay in three Parts, first written to a Gentleman in the University, and since fitted for Publick Use.

A Moral Discourse of the Power of Interest, by *David Abercromby*, M. D. and Fellow of the Colledge at *Amsterdam*.

Contemplations of the State of Man in this Life and in that which is to come, by *Fer. Taylor*, D. D. and late Lord Bishop of *Down and Connor*. The Fourth Edition.

A Week of Soliloquies and Prayers, with a Preparation for the Holy Communion, and other Devotions added to this Edition, in two Parts, by *Peter Du Moulin*, D. D.

Mr. *Doolittle's* Call to Delaying Sinners, or the Danger of Delaying in Matters of our Souls. The Third Edition.

All Persons that live remote from *London*, and have a desire to sell the following things, viz. *Bateman's* Spirit of Scurvy-grass, *Daffy's* Elixir Salutis, *Anderson's* Scotch Pill, *Japan* Ink, Extract of Liquorish, *Fletcher's* Powder, *Mathew's* Pill, *German* Balls, *Queen's* Cephalick Snuff, Spirit of Salt, may repair to *Dorman Newman*, at the *King's-Arms* in the *Poultry*.

